Christian Faith and Life

Combining The Bible Champion and The Essentialist

Volume 37 JUNE, 1931 Number 6

EDITORIAL

Church Statistics for the Year 1930

THE Church statistics for the year 1930 as compiled by Dr. G. L. Keiffer, and published in the *Christian Herald* for May are most interesting. We will not reproduce them in full, but will present the figures for five of the leading denominations.

The Baptist Church reports 9,216,562 members, which is a gain of 74,706. The Lutheran Church reports 2,806,797 members, a gain of 56,180. The Protestant Episcopal Church shows it has gained 16,532 and has a total membership of 1,254,227. These three churches made definite gains; two of them are definitely liturgical; one of them is superlatively free.

The Presbyterians report 2,677,369 members, and a loss of 22,763. The Methodists report a membership of 9,216,562, and a loss of 43,211.*

This difference between gains and losses is striking, and the more so now that it is a repeated fact. Methodism has shown a painful loss two years in succession, the Lutheran Church has lead Protestant denominations in America in its increase not only this year, but it has been showing a steady increase across a span of years. Something must explain this situation.

Having read these returns, the thought came to this writer to compare the percentages of gains and losses with the percentages of denominational belief and disbelief as presented by Professor George H. Betts of North Western University in his revealing volume, *The Beliefs of 700 Ministers.* The comparison will take only an instant, and the striking fact is that the relative position of the denominations in point of degree of faith is almost their identical position in the scale of gains and losses. If Professor Betts' figures mean anything, they reveal that it makes a vast difference in their efficiency whether the Churches preach the historic Christian Faith or Liberalism.

The order of the denominations in respect of their Liberalism or unbelief as stated by

* *The Methodist Episcopal Church itself lost* 29,820.

Christian Faith and Life

THOSE who believe in historic Christianity, and desire to proclaim it and defend it, sometimes overlook the importance of the printed page. Those who propagate error do not. There is no greater need today than strong, scholarly, evangelical literature to offset the wide-spread dissemination of a pseudo-Christianity. CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE gives promise of great service in the field of Christian Apologetics. We ought not to be led astray by the popular saying that Christianity is to be proclaimed and not defended. If that is true, it would put a fool's cap on St. Paul and much of the New Testament. The remarkable change which came over Abraham Lincoln's religious views is to be attributed to a strong defense of the Christian faith, the book by Dr. James Smith, *The Christian's Defense.* All those who desire to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in them will find help and profit in the perusal of the pages of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE.—*Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D.*

Professor Betts is as follows: Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Baptists, Lutherans. Congregationalists are most liberal. Methodists are second. Baptists and Lutherans stand at the other end of the line as least liberal or more orthodox. Professor Betts' percentages in detail will be interesting.

On the doctrine of the Trinity of God: Congregational ministers show 36 per cent believing, Methodists 72 per cent, Presbyterians 78 per cent, Baptists 86 per cent, Episcopalians 96 per cent, Lutherans 99 per cent.

On the doctrine of the unique inspiration of the Bible: Congregational 40 per cent, Methodist 53 per cent, Presbyterian 66 per cent, Episcopalian 68 per cent, Baptist 70 per cent, Lutheran 98 per cent.

On the Virgin Birth of Jesus: Congregational 25 per cent, Methodist 54 per cent, Presbyterian 66 per cent, Episcopalian 75 per cent, Baptist 80 per cent, Lutheran 90 per cent.

On our Lord's Resurrection: Congregational 36 per cent, Methodist 74 per cent, Baptist 82 per cent, Presbyterian 86 per cent, Episcopalian 100 per cent, Lutheran 100 per cent.

On Miracles the percentages are: Congregational 43 per cent, Methodist 53 per cent, Presbyterian 57 per cent, Baptist 64 per cent, Episcopalian 67 per cent, Lutheran 98 per cent.

On the Atonement for Sin in the Cross: Congregational 20 per cent, Methodist 60 per cent, Presbyterian 67 per cent, Episcopalian 68 per cent, Baptist 75 per cent, Lutheran 99 per cent.

These percentages as added up show the total percentage of faith is: Congregational 30 per cent, Methodist 61 per cent, Presbyterian 70 per cent, Episcopal 75+ per cent, Baptist 76 per cent, Lutheran 96 per cent.

Turning now from these figures as presented by Professor Betts to the fruition of the toil of these Churches during the year 1930 their relative positions are almost identically the same.

The Congregational Church is defective, being either wanting or combined with the Christian Church. Methodism stands next with a loss of 43,211. Presbyterians hold the third place with a loss of 22,763. Then come the Episcopalians with a gain of 16,532, the Baptists with a gain of 74,706 on 9,216,562, and the Lutherans with a gain of 56,108 on 2,806,797.

In other words, the Lutherans show the highest percentage of faith, and their Church made the greatest gains, namely, 2 per cent on its membership. Baptists and Episcopalians stand exceedingly close in percentage of faith, namely 76 per cent and 75 per cent, and they stand exceedingly close in their percentage of gains, namely .8 per cent and 1.3 per cent. Presbyterians and Methodists fall lower in their percentages of faith and lower also in their membership returns, both denominations showing a loss.

Here is a scientific demonstration that Liberalism from the point of view of actual effectiveness in the work of the Church is a serious handicap. The more liberal the Church the less is its spiritual fruitage; the less Liberal (more orthodox) the Church the greater its spiritual fruitage.

The most Liberal denomination of all is of course the Unitarian body. In a hundred years it has shrunk from about the 100,000 figure down to 57,931 and shows a loss during the current year of about 8 per cent. Methodism, which according to Professor Betts would stand third, with only the Congregational Church in between, shows a loss of .4 per cent.*

Is it not about time for the Churches to turn from Liberalism, which is only incipient Unitarianism, and turn back to the faith of the ages?

One final circumstance which enforces the explanation of the relative decline among the Churches as given above. The writer was recently in touch with a group of theological students identified with one of the great liberal American schools. The students were frankly in confusion. They did not know definitely what they did believe, and several of them admitted that they had no enthusiasm for the message they were preaching. They said our professors have no enthusiasm for what they are teaching us, and we have no enthusiasm for what we are preaching. Everything is flat, colorless, dead. This is what the young men themselves feel. What prospect is there that their preaching of ideas which leave their own hearts cold can inflame the hearts of their fellow men?

It is time to turn back to faith. Science itself is pointing the way. We do not need to ask science to lead us; but we can let the new science with its tremendous theistic tendency answer the old science which was aggressively naturalistic, and then ourselves turn to the Word of God and to Jesus, God

* *The loss of the Methodist Episcopal Church is .73 per cent.*

the Incarnate Son, and follow this leadership back into power. The Holy Spirit is in the Church; but He cannot bless the uncertainty and unbelief we are preaching. We must once again have the full orbed Gospel of Christ, and then we will once more have the power and glory of Pentecost as again and again before.—*H. P. S.*

The World's Need for Religion

This is the first of two companion editorials, the second, which will appear in July, being "The Religion the World Needs."

IT is a well known fact that religion is universal. It is often degraded to mere superstition which makes it almost unrecognizable; but everywhere the human heart is reaching out to some dimly conceived supernatural for succor and defense.

It has been thought by some that the increase of science will at last leave religion behind. It is, however, a vain and superficial idea. The progress of science has in no way affected the world's need for religion. Religion is older than science, and its basis in the moral and affectional nature of man gives to it a stability and a security which is superior to science.

The great need of the world in every age is religion. The need for religion today is pressing, insistent. Without religion life cannot go forward. Without religion civilization cannot even be maintained. The Russian propaganda of Atheism, represented also in America, is only an expression of the proud depravity of man's heart. We love self-sufficiency. We love the wild freedom of an ungoverned life, and it is that rather than our science or learning that comes to expression in history's recurring tides of Atheism.

The world's need of religion can be stated under three heads: Its need of religion to complete the fundamental values of life; its need of religion to energize civilization for its next great social advance; its need of religion to prepare men for the experience and mystery of death.

Beauty has always thrilled me. Clear back into my childhood I remember standing to wonder at tall stately trees that rise straight and high like pillars of a temple, or at fiery clouds that spread the sky with glory, or at the almost mystic shine of the forest when the sun breaks through the clouds at evening after a storm.

As a youth I have stood and thrilled at these beauties, tried to possess myself of them, to fix their glory in my memory, but ever have been conscious of my failure, of my inability to possess them. Repeatedly I have come away with a baffled sense of the futility of beauty. Beauty had seemed good for nothing. I had gazed at it, and it had only made me lonely, disappointed, sad.

One day I learned the explanation. To experience great beauty is to be lifted into self-consciousness, the realization of self; and the realization of self is always a lonely experience. When a man stands alone on a mountain summit with the world at his feet, or alone on the shore of the sea gazing abroad at the majesty of waters, his sense of self makes him feel like some tiny solitary match burning in the immensities of space. This sense of loneliness craves companionship, and so beauty, if it is to enrich life, must not only quicken us to self-consciousness, but it must also bring us with itself the sense of companionship.

Take a common experience. You were going through a garden. You saw a lovely rose. You plucked it, gazed at it, smelled it, put it in your coat or your hair, and then forgot it. You rejoiced in the rose, and yet it eluded you. You could not possess it. You missed its abiding delight.

But suppose instead you were walking through that garden with one you loved, and other fingers plucked that rose and gave it to you as a symbol and token of love—how different it would have been! The loveliness of the rose would have taken on new meaning. You could not have forgotten it. It would have been a joy constantly revived. Again and again you would have gazed at it. It would have spoken not only itself but the one who gave it to you. Its grace and perfume would have been channels that conveyed to you a precious personal love. When the rose is thus appropriated not only as beautiful but also as bringing to us in its beauty the message of a precious personal love, then and only then is it fully ours.

Beauty to be effective must be the setting and symbol of personal love. Only when it is this can its values be appropriated to the full. Beauty that is not thus in relation to

personality is illusive, baffling, disappointing; and so the beauty of the universe needs religion to complete it. The majesty of the starry sky as just stars palls on us. We need to see it as the expression of the Infinite Fatherhood. The loveliness of spring's flowers is only a riot of bloom when it stands unrelated; but as a symbol and expression of the unbounded love of God it is an unfailing joy.

We are personalities, forever in quest of personality; and nothing short of the touch of a personality can satisfy us. Only when beauty is the breath of personal love is it fully effective. And as our smaller earthly beauties need to be made the vehicle of human love to be effective, just so the universe needs to have its beauties personalized, to have them made the vehicle and expression of the love of God. Creation needs God as much to fulfill its loveliness as to explain its objectivity.

Religion is thus necessary to the completing of one of the most fundamental values of experience: the value of beauty. And what is true of beauty is true also of duty. Fundamental duty presupposes religion. A professor of psychology who did not believe in God or the future life was trying to make social obligations convincing to his class. He spoke of the obligation so to live that the next generation would have a fair chance for life. His appeal failed. He reports the students as replying: Let the next generation take care of itself, we don't owe it anything.

Duty is thus seen as deprived of all reality when religion is denied. Life bounded by the cradle and the grave is too small for duty. On such a basis the sacrifices of the martyrs and the patriots become vain, romantic, absurd. What obligation is there for one man to die at Belleau Woods or Gettysburg or Bunker Hill that another man might enjoy the fruits of his sacrifice? What reality is there in the thought that one man owes it to cease to be that another man might for a moment thrill in the joy of liberty? Manifestly without religion there is no obligation to such a sacrifice. If religion and its infinites be untrue, the whole conception of duty falls to the ground as a vain illusion.

Once Huxley wrote, in substance, with evident depression: "I get little comfort from the thought that I will know no more of the universe and be no more to it in 1890 than I was in 1790. Against the background of such a depressing diminutive sense of life it is impossible to feel any authority in the sense of duty. Duty needs the religious value of spiritual immortality to be convincing."

Without religion Beauty fails. Without religion duty is empty; and it is the same with truth and love and every other fundamental of life.

The unbelief of ancient civilization had come through to its fruitage in Pontius Pilate. He was an Epicurean, denying God and duty and living in and for pleasure. Jesus in His trial before him spoke of truth saying: "For this cause came I unto the world that I should bear witness to the truth" (John 18:37). Truth was majestic to Jesus even in the hour of supreme sacrifice. Pilate replied with the mockery of cynicism in his voice, "What is truth?" Truth for Pilate was as empty of reality as it would be for a man of fifty to hang his sock at the fire place and go to bed hoping for Santa Clause. Unbelief abolishes truth. For the behaviorist each man's truth is only his personal fate and neither he nor any one else will ever know whether his or some other's fate was true. When man and his opinions are only chance combinations of some vast universal kaleidoscope truth is done.

So, once again, it is with respect to love. Love can only come to its fulfillment in a religious life. Love hates death; is consciously violated by death. Like duty, it demands and presupposes eternal life. The facts are even larger. Love is the joyous fellowship of lives that rejoice in each other's perfections; and these perfections must include also moral perfections. Love is built upon truth, duty, beauty; and the infinities of religion that are necessary to these are necessary also to it. The love of Augustine and Monica, his mother, as they sat together at Ostia, out under the stars, down by the sea, communing of the Infinite, was one thing. The love of any unbeliever, who lives in his little sense world without God and bounded by the cradle and the grave, is inevitably another thing. Was it simply loyalty to duty or was it also the difference in their love which made the Christians of Carthage remain in the city during the devastating epidemic which smote it during the third century, when the pagan population left their own dead and dying and fled? In part, doubtless, it was duty; but in large part it was their richer love. Love comes to its best only in the elevating atmosphere of religious faith.

Without religion, then, every fundamental

life value is weakened and reduced toward unreality. Beauty becomes insipid. Duty becomes unreal. Truth is abolished. And even Love is blighted. Religion is thus seen to be the fundamental need of life. As the sun is the spring of all physical life in the universe, so religion is the spring of all spiritual value. Without sunlight every vital force fails. Without religion every spiritual force is emasculated and withers unto death.

The abstract thinker can see this by a study of the values themselves; but every one can see it when man's appropriation of these forces is translated into history. England was only saved from the devastating influence of the philosophy of Deism by the Wesleyan revival. Deist England was drunken, politically corrupt, economically oppressive. The Wesleyan revival made it a new England. In France there was no religious revival and Deism produced instead the Reign of Terror. England in the nineteenth century, as a result of the revival, went steadily forward. Reform followed reform. Her commerce was on every sea and her influence extended to all the earth; but France went through revolution after revolution and passed out of the nineteenth century with a population scarcely any larger than it had gone into it with. Yet college professors blindly speak of religion as holding back human progress, and the man on the street ignorantly supposes that religion does not matter so long as his food and clothing and amusements are unaffected!

The world needs religion today, for the times are crucial. The world needs religion because civilization is standing either at the threshold of a mighty new advance or else at the threshold of a serious and tragic collapse.

The Reformation made modern history, but the Reformation truths are being neglected today as if they were a spent force. The Reformation impregnated a generation with the truth of God; it energized Europe with high principles and caused civilization to leap forward.

It translated the Bible into the vernacular and printing it put it into the hands of the people.

It made religion a vivid reality, a personal experience for which men would if need be sacrifice and even die.

It abolished slavery and other abuses.

It created free governments.

It promoted learning and brought education to the masses.

These common blessings are all the fruits of religion. And yet, we the blessed are neglecting religion. We are neglecting our Bibles. We are sacrificing the Lord's day to our indolence. We are refusing to give ourselves in the worship of God, and are allowing ungodly men to fill with the clamor of worldly excitement America's great Christian day of the soul. Baseball and the pictures are demanding a seven-day week. Those who love ideals are indolent. The Church has largely forgotten its responsibility for the souls of men. We do not reprove sin, nor do we seek to rescue each other from it. Divorce increases. Ideals are denied or thrust aside. God is less and less in our thoughts. And we are not even conscious of the shame of our failure. And yet while we are thus idle the times are crucial.

It is significant that there is a sufficient volume of social unrest to observe the first of May annually with threatened violence that calls for special police vigilance.

It is significant that machine production has resulted in a world-wide economic crisis. That the very abundance of our wealth has made us poor. That because there is so much therefore man must go hungry and naked and in want.

It is significant that the alternative of the nations has become not peace or war, but peace or annihilation.

It is significant that just now science which has led the world up the blind alley of materialism and naturalism should be leading the reaction back to God.

We are at the gate way of a new day—will it be better than yesterday or worse? The answer depends upon religion. We need religion to gird us for our mighty undertaking. We need a generation energized with the reality of God as our fathers before us.

We must develop such a sincerity of brotherhood that the governments of the world can be effective in their program for the abolition of war. We must come to see again that the large places in life belong to those who have the courage and the application to achieve them. We must learn to appreciate without jealousy our great men who are the benefactors of us all; but we must produce a class of great men who will find their life's fulfillment not in the size of their fortunes so much as in the number of those, their fellow men, whom they have helped to success.

The opportunity of our world is unlimited in science and material resource. Its

peril is the failure of ideals. Its need is religion. With religion we can achieve anything. Without it we must tragically fail.

But finally the world needs religion because it is a world of death. Death is the supreme problem and burden of life. It shadows us in bereavement. We begin to die when our loved ones go from us. The home where death has come can never be the same again. It shadows us again in the experience of approaching age, in sickness, pain and frailty. And then at last it comes to us. Death—the end of earth! Death—the mystery of the infinite! Nothing but religion can meet this crisis. In death it is religion or the dark. In the presence of death our science will seem as meaningless as a child's mud pies would seem to a hungry man. Our wealth will seem equally meaningless. Wealth cannot buy exemption from the tomb. All our accomplishments will fail us. Napoleon, who had trodden continents beneath mailed feet, waited for death as helpless as any child. Religion, and religion alone, can equip us for that hour. "What can you tell me about God? Quick!" cried the dying soldier. He was beyond water. He was beyond wealth. He was beyond science. At last it was religion, and religion alone that mattered.

Yes, the world needs religion. It needs it to complete its chiefest and most fundamental values. It needs it to inspire its heart and energize its will. It needs it because the hour has struck for a new advance like the Reformation, or else for a new collapse like the fall of the Greco-Roman civilization. The world needs religion, and it needs it supremely because it is populated with dying individuals, who must find some strength and light to comfort them as they face the majesty and awe of death. The world needs religion—what religion does it need?—*H. P. S.*

The Scientist and God

THE American Tract Society has done the world a service in reproducing Professor Michel Pupin's *Commemoration Address,* delivered at Columbia University some few years ago. We are quoting some extensive excerpts from this address as recently reprinted in the *Sunday School Times.* In a period when there is so much doubt and unbelief being promulgated it is a tonic to read such an affirmation of faith by one of the world's greatest scientists; but the fact is, it is pseudo-science that is unbelieving. Science at the top is humble and believing and often definitely Christian. We are reprinting the list we published some months since with additions of outstanding men of science alive today who are firm believers in theism and often also in the historic Christian faith.

With all deference to these great men, we nevertheless hold, once it is admitted, the phenomena of life and the universe indicate the existence of an infinite mind, that the interpretation of the ultimate mystery of being rightfully belongs to the theologian; and we hold further that no theologian is more capable of facing this task than the man who week after week, and year after year, has lived in intimate sympathy with the pressing moral and spiritual problems of life as the pastor of a church. Granted the truth of Theism, life itself is a laboratory and the only laboratory where speculative opinions can be brought to the test. If, as is so often affirmed, life is the ultimate test, then it is the man who has been living amid the pressure and problem of life rather than the man who is cloistered who is best equipped to speak responsibly. But for the true Christian experience is not the ultimate test. Experience is inadequate and must be supplemented by revelation. The Word of God is final.

But to resume. We accept the testimony of these great men as to the truth of Theism, and then leaving them, claim the right to go on for ourselves to explore the ultimate mysteries. In our theistic faith however we greatly rejoice in the support of such great men as Professor Michel Pupin, physicist of Columbia University; Professor James Jeans, physicist, of England; Dr. William Lyon Phelps, Professor of English Literature at Yale University; Dr. W. R. Whitney, head of the General Electric Research Bureau; Sir Arthur Eddyington, astronomer, of England; Professor Arthur Compton, physicist, of Chicago; Professor Robert Millikin, physicist, California Institute of Technology; Professor Harold Shapley, astronomer, of

Harvard University; Professor Charles T. Olliver, astronomer, University of Pennsylvania; Dean George Walk, head of the College of Education, Temple University, psychologist; Professor Arthur Holmes, psychologist at the University of Pennsylvania.

We now add the splendid statement from Professor Pupin's pen.

"Fifty years ago I heard for the first time the words of David's Nineteenth Psalm: 'The heavens declare the glory of God. . . . There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.' My mother explained their meaning to me. She firmly believed that David's Psalms are the fountain of wisdom. The Nineteenth Psalm was her favorite and so it was mine. It was the chant of an inspired shepherd.

"Fifty years have passed since I first saw that picture of the world on the Serbian pasture lands. Since that time I have spent most of my life in American fields of learning. The world to me is a world of language, of messages, of communications. Man is only a humble listener. . . . We are now deciphering messages sent by the stars long before the prophet Daniel heard the voice of the Archangel Gabriel on the banks of Ulai; even before the Cherubims with their flaming swords barred Adam's approach to the road which led to the Tree of Life. When these messages, after their voyages lasting aeons and aeons, are finally deciphered we shall know more of the truth hidden in the electrical structure of the atom and in the structure of stars in the firmament. A new meaning will then be revealed in David's chant: 'The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork.'

"Newton was the greatest scientist and also one of the most religious men of his time. The same is true of Faraday, of Ampere, and of many other great scientific men of all times. Yet in the popular mind one often finds the opinion that scientific men are agnostics. A young woman asked me the other day:

" 'Professor, are you going to preach on Sunday on Columbia's Memorial Day?'

"I answered, 'Yes.'

" 'May I know what your subject is to be?'

" 'God and human life,' said I. 'What else could it be?'

"She looked surprised, and then asked, 'Do you, a scientific man, believe in God?'

"I gasped, but recovering composure answered:

" 'I know there is a God, and it is the only knowledge that I have which is worth anything. I have just received two messages from God; one is joyous, the other very sad. The joyous one tells me that your eyes are blue and your hair is a golden yellow. Beauty is a joy forever. The sad message warns me that a spiritual vacuum is the saddest and most distressing thing for the human soul to contemplate.' "

After a striking parallel between the telephone systems of cities and the marvelous signalling system in the human body Professor Pupin adds: "That wonderful signalling system which God planted in the earthly clay of Adam's body when He, according to Genesis, 'breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul,' is the instrumentality by means of which God's spirit communicates with the soul of man. The existence of this instrumentality is the most concrete physical evidence that God loves the soul of man and that He also loves the body.

"Do not say 'busy' when the Lord is calling because every fiber of the message—conducting network of nerves and cells connecting our soul to the external world was laid in order to provide a service for God."

—*H. P. S.*

How impressive and inspiring is the pulpit prayer which largely is interlarded with apt Scriptural petitions and praises and ascriptions of honor and glory to God? There are no prayer books like the Bible, and in the Psalms alone most wonderful petitions enough to fill pulpit prayers for a year with ever fresh materials. And think of Paul's prayers in his Epistles, how they enrich present prayers with a larger reach of faith, passionate love, and fervor nowhere else found. In any case why not have better prayers in the pulpit? What a wrong done to good congregations to make them listen to commonplace, droned out almost unfeeling, pastoral intercession Sunday after Sunday?—*Methodist.*

Saying prayers is by no means always praying. Christians who really know how to pray are far too scarce.—*Southern Methodist.*

" 'Would' in this world is a mere zero to 'should.' "

Current Religious Thought

Comments on Topics of the Times

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

Note the Beautiful Teleology

That is rather a big word—teleology. But its meaning is perfectly plain. It means purpose or design. In Gen.1:14 we read: "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years." Well, that is just what the sun, moon and stars are doing for this planet on which we live. Without them we could not exist. It is as evident as anything can be that God designed them for the very purpose which they subserve so wonderfully. He prepared the earth, with its soil, its vegetables and animals, and then created and formed man in such a way that he would fit into the environment which was pre-determined for him by almighty wisdom.

Purpose of the Heavenly Bodies

The foregoing paragraph was purposely composed in view of what we desire to quote from our good evangelical friend, Harry Rimmer, whose brochures we like to commend. In his book, *Modern Science and the Fourth Day of Creation,* he declares that "the stars are sign posts in nature." Then he says: "The science of navigation would be utterly impossible without the aid of the heavenly bodies. When the storms and the mists obscure the heavens for a sufficient period of time, even the ablest navigator is lost. By the use of his instruments the navigator 'shoots the sun,' and determines his position on the boundless deep. At night the stars in their splendor keep him on his course, and the heavenly orbs are signs to the traveler by sea or by land."

More Marks of Purpose

But our friend has more to say about the heavenly bodies: "They are signs to the farmer as well. When certain constellations flame in the sky, we know that spring has come, and it is time to hasten the planting that there may later be the seasonal harvest. When the later orbs appear, the man of wisdom knows that it is too late to plant any but the hardiest species, for the winter is on the way. So the present age relies on such helps as the almanac and astronomy can give us in the forecast of the seasons, and we faithfully obey the signs in the heavens so we may know when to plant that we may later eat. . . . When Moses states that the heavenly bodies determine also by their appearance the days, the years and the seasons, he is absolutely accurate in his contention."

The Likeness of God and Man

The very fact that God created man in His own image furnishes the explanation of what are known as the anthropomorphisms of the Bible. Many liberalists today object to them. Just what kind of an absolute and immobile monad they would prefer we cannot determine from their nebulous phrasings. But why these Biblical expressions of God's likeness to man in the Holy Bible? To make God more real to us; to enable us better to understand His character and feel His sympathy. As another suggests: "He would thus help us to realize the precious kinship that exists between Him and us." When He placed the rainbow in the heavens after the great deluge, He says that when He looks upon it, He will remember His covenant never again to destroy the earth with a flood. Does God need reminders? In Himself He does not, but He wants us to know that He remembers His covenant promises. How vivid and impressive are the anthropomorphisms of the Bible!

Importance of Christ's Resurrection

The apostle Paul certainly made the resurrection of our Lord vital and basic in the Christian system of salvation. Just stop long enough to read Rom.10:9: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus Christ, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." It should be noted here that a mere intellectual assent to the resurrection of Christ is not enough. "If thou shalt believe in thine heart" is a most important condi-

tion. Well, if a man is truly converted, he has no trouble about believing in his heart whatever the Bible says about Christ and the salvation He wrought for men by his death and resurrection.

The Certainty of Consciousness

An impressive article by Dr. H. C. Morton appears in the last volume issued by the Victoria Institute of Great Britain on "Evolution and the New Psychology." Let us quote (p. 224): "Of the immediate deliverances of consciousness we are certain. Those who adduce reasons for doubting consciousness, themselves depend upon the very consciousness they doubt. Moreover, the doubts are the culmination of long sophisticated processes of thinking. After much effort, man's mind is able to conceive the idea of determinism. But at once, when the strain of thought is over, the mind, like a relaxed bow, returns to the unforced consciousness of its natural freedom." Then he says that, if Behaviorism is true, such major words as motive, incentive, purpose, desire, choice, and responsibility have no meaning. "Then how did the very ideas come into existence? If it be answered, 'Illusion,' then whence the illusion?"

Differences More Marked Than Similarities

The volume just alluded to contains a brief address by Mr. Avary H. Forbes which contains a lot of sense. Here is a sample: "All this deification of the material is the vice of philosophy as applied to evolution: for the *moral* differences between man and the ape are a thousand-fold more important than any physical similarities; and they disprove heredity far more conclusively than the physical resemblance may seem to assert it. And yet this line of argument is almost entirely ignored by both scientists and philosophers." It certainly is high time for men to accent the moral and spiritual in man and their absence from the animal realm. Then how could non-moral and non-spiritual creatures ever evolve by means of resident forces into moral and spiritual personalities? They could not! It is impossible and absurd. Why? Because the "resident forces" were not there.

The Bible and Religious Experience

We confess that a question-mark often arises in our mind when we hear or read the statement: "The Bible is a record of the religious experience of the Hebrew people." Do the users of this assertion mean that the experience was truly given to the Hebrew people by the Holy Spirit and that the writers were divinely inspired in recording those experiences? Or do they mean that the writers were merely giving their own ideas of their experiences; that they simply thought that they were telling the truth. Nor is that all. It surely was not the Hebrew people as a nation who were divinely inspired. They were only too blind, too apt to go astray, too prone to disobey God and to go after other gods. They had to be rebuked, corrected and punished many times on account of their apostasies. Who, then, were divinely inspired? The leaders and prophets who were divinely chosen and called to deliver God's messages to them. So it seems to us that the foregoing statements are more confusing than enlightening. Let us see about it further.

The Biblical Writers and their Experiences

It seems to us like this: If God gave to the Biblical writers a true inner spiritual experience of purely spiritual truths, then, if they, in addition, were divinely guided, they might have recorded them with inerrancy. But that is far from the whole story. There are many facts recorded in the Bible which the writers could not have experienced. For example, no man could have experienced the facts narrated in the first chapter of Genesis before any self-conscious human beings were created. Even after the first man was created, he would have had to be told by his Creator that he had been created in the divine image. After his body was fashioned from the finest material of the soil (*aphar*), and his soul was united with it, God would have had to reveal to him how he came into existence as a dual being. Would it not be better and clearer to say that the writers of the Bible were divinely inspired to write what they did, and that what they could not otherwise know was divinely revealed to them—would not that be better and simpler than to mix up this matter of "religious experience" with the production of the Bible? Listen to the Word itself: "The things which are hidden belong to the Lord our God; but the things which are revealed belong to us and our children forever" (Deut.29:29).

Christ and the Scriptures

Another slogan that is on the lips of a good many modern people is that whatever

relates to Christ in the Bible is to be accepted; or, in other words, Christ is the authoritative norm of the Holy Scriptures. But does not that imply a dangerous doctrine? While its exponents do not say so frankly, yet they seem to imply that there are parts of the Bible which do not apply to Christ, and therefore they need not be accepted as authoritative and divinely inspired. If they should reply that there is nothing in the Bible that is not connected with Christ, then their statement is superfluous, and they are trying to make a distinction where there is no difference. But take as an example the story of the great age of the antediluvian patriarchs —has that any direct connection with Christ? What is the connection of the stories of Saul, Sampson, Esther and Ruth with Christ? Because Christ, the Messiah, is not named or predicted in these narratives, are they not to be accepted as a part of the Canonical Scriptures? Does it not seem, therefore, that the said slogan is a dangerous one, and may be used to cast doubt on many parts of the Bible?

Our Lord's Testimony

We think that the following is a much safer and more evangelical position regarding the relation of the Christ to the Bible: He testified again and again to the divine character and authority of the Old Testament, and never rejected or criticized any part of it. Therefore He placed His own stamp and seal upon it, and for that reason we can accept it all as God's holy Word, whether we can trace a direct reference to Christ in all parts of it or not. If our Lord said that the Old Testament Scriptures testify of Him, then we may well draw the conclusion that the parts that do not refer directly to Him are necessary as historical settings to make plain and concrete the parts that do connect up directly with Him. When our Lord says, "The Scriptures cannot be broken," that ought to be sufficient proof for every believer in the Lord Jesus Christ. Moreover, Paul, speaking of the Old Testament, said: "All Scripture is God-breathed." And Peter is no less positive in his testimony: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

The Supplanting Power of the Word

What a suggestive saying is that of the Psalmist: "Thy Word have I hid in my heart that I might not sin against thee." The proper place to put the Word of God is in the heart; not in the intellect alone, but in the intellect that it might find its way into the heart. When we get the Word in our hearts, sin will be crowded out; the evil will be supplanted by the good. For example, we cannot be neglectful of God or ungrateful for His mercies and benefactions if the Word is hidden in our hearts, because that Word says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," Neither can we cherish hatred in our hearts toward any of our fellowmen, for the Word says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and also commands us to love our enemies. So it is with the whole list of sins: Get God's Word, which is pure and holy, into your heart, and it will eliminate sin from your life. "Wonderful Words, beautiful Words, wonderful Words of life!"

Christ also in the Heart

But the Word of God is not alone; it is not a mere word; it is not mere literature, not even mere religious literature. If it were, it would be as ineffective for salvation and the holy life as other literature. The Word of God is much more than just cultural. It is Christ in the Word as His chief means of grace that gives dynamic and life to the Word. When the enlightening Word comes into our minds and hearts, it tells us about Christ, the Lord and Saviour, who is then accepted by spiritually enabled faith. Thus the living Christ comes into the heart; and when Christ and His Word dwell in the heart, sin cannot dwell there. Yes, sin will be cast out. This doctrine is in accord with the teaching of Christ and Paul: "Abide in me, and I in you;" "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you," etc.; "Christ in you, the hope of glory;" "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

What they found at Ur

In many books and papers we read about the discoveries at Ur of the Chaldees, Abraham's first home. Mr. Leonard Woolley gives the most vivid description of these finds. We quote from Mr. W. Hoste's discussion in the last *Journal* of the Victoria Institute (pp. 90,191): "They had been excavating a royal graveyard outside the city, which rests on what had been in previous centuries the city dust-heaps. Going down sixty feet and passing through still more wonderful graves, giving proof of an extra-

ordinarily advanced civilization, they were suddenly pulled up by a layer of clay about eight feet thick, distributed uniformly on all sides and completely interrupting all traces of civilization; containing no pottery and evidently laid down in a very brief period. Digging through this clay, they found the remains of a much older and quite distinct civilization. . . . Mr. Woolley had not the slightest doubt that this layer of clay was deposited by the Sumerian or Noachian Flood, which has always been supported, not only by the Bible narratives, but by widespread and persistent Sumerian (and, indeed, universal) tradition. Dr. Stephen Langdon, Professor of Assyriology at Oxford, though at first hostile, has declared his conversion to this view."

Who Can Write Another Twenty-Third Psalm?

A valiant champion of the divine inspiration of the Bible recently issued a challenge over the radio to the disparagers of the Bible to write something as beautiful, helpful and enduring as the Twenty-third Psalm. He wanted them just to try their hand at such a composition. We have no fear that the challenge will be accepted. There are other lyrics that may have as much rhythm and felicity of literary expression as this Psalm; but none of them combine with these qualities so much help, comfort and tender sympathy from the divine Source of all blessing. Just take as an example, Dr. Moffatt's attempt to translate this Psalm into what he calls "modern English." There is that touching verse, the 4th: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." How sweet and touching! But note Moffatt's attempt at translating this verse: "My road may run through a glen of gloom, but I fear no harm, for thou art besides me; thy club, thy staff—they give me courage." That surely has no lyrical merit—no rhythm that appeals to one's literary sense of beauty.

Congratulations to Hampden-Sidney College

This college, located at Hampden-Sidney, Va., is known for its stalwart evangelical position. Its president, Dr. J. D. Eggleston, is one of the choice men of our land. A gratifying honor has brought this college into the lime-light, where it deserves to be. It has been discovered that a greater percentage of its alumni are listed in *Who's Who in America* than of any other college. It is not a large college, but its scholastic standing is high, as is evidenced by the distinction that has just come to it. This fact proves that a truly evangelical college can stand in the front rank of real scholarship.

The Resurrection of Christ Fundamental

While Jesus Christ is the foundation of the Christian faith (1 Cor.3:11), it is the *total* Biblical Christ who constitutes that foundation. A humanly devised Christ is not the foundation. Paul, who told us that Christ is the foundation, laid much emphasis on the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, as well as His true deity and humanity. He wrote that, if Christ be not risen from the dead, our faith is vain; we are yet in our sins. That great theologian of the preceding generation, Dr. Alexander M. Fairbairn, made the following positive declarations: "The resurrection created the church, the risen Christ made Christianity, and even now the Christian faith stands or falls with Him. If it be proved that no living Christ issued from the tomb of Joseph, then that tomb became the grave, not only of a man, but of a religion, with all the hopes built on it and all the splendid enthusiasms it has inspired." Strong words these, and true.

Einstein in Strange Company

Over the doorway of Riverside Church, New York, Rev. Harry E. Fosdick, pastor, the image of Einstein is carved in company with images of Christ, angels and saints. Yet in an article in the New York *Times* Mr. Einstein declared that "the ethical behavior of mankind needs no support from religion." He also looks upon man as an irresponsible automaton, and teaches the doctrine of determinism in psychology. Thus we read: "A God who rewards or who punishes is unthinkable, because man acts in accordance with an inner and outer necessity, and would in the sight of God be as little responsible as is an inanimate object." We are wondering, then, why Einstein should be placed in company with Christ, angels and saints over the entrance of a supposedly Christian church. What must be the theology of a minister who either suggested or permitted such a combination to be made!

Christ versus Einstein

Let us note that contradiction between the teaching of Christ and that of the Jewish scientist. Einstein says that man is not free to choose. Christ said to the Pharisees, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." Einstein holds that man is not responsible, no more so than an inanimate object. Christ said: "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Capernaum!" And again: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned." Then how can Christ and Einstein be put in the same company by any one who claims to be a Christian?

A Scientist on Theism

For some of the material in the two preceding paragraphs we are indebted to an article by Ernest Gordon in the *Sunday School Times* for March 21st. In the same article he tells us about the difference between Einstein and Michael Pupin. The latter is a Christian Scientist. Here is something that is surely worth reprinting. It is from Pupin: A young woman asked him whether he was going to preach on a certain day. He replied, "Yes." She wanted to know what his subject would be. He replied, "God and Human Life. What else could it be?" She asked: "Do you, a scientific man, believe in God?" He replied: "I know there is a God, and it is the only knowledge that I have which is worth anything. I have just received two messages from God; one is joyous, the other is very sad. The joyous one tells me that your eyes are blue and your hair is golden yellow. Beauty is a joy forever. The sad message warns me that a spiritual vacuum is the saddest and most distressing thing for a human soul to contemplate." What a telling phrase, "a spiritual vacuum!"

John Barleycorn must not Return

The people who are longing and working for the return of the reign of John Barleycorn should read the sad story of Jack London's booze fighting as it is described in the *Sunday School Times* for April 12, 1931. He had gotten into the grip of liquor. He had everything to make life worth living, if worldly honor, success and emolument could achieve such a state of mind. Yet he was sad, depressed, *blasé*. Why? Because he knew that he was an addict—that John Barleycorn had the better of him; that soon he would succumb to the death-dealing power of liquor. It had mastered him body and soul. He could not break the fetters that John Barleycorn had bound about him. The inevitable stared him in the face. The story is one of the saddest ever told. Liquor ruined him; slew him in the midst of his years. Being a "materialistic monist," he refused to look to the Divine One for help, and so that arch-murderer of men, John Barleycorn, sent him to an untimely grave. What a lesson for all men! Let us beware of John Barleycorn. He must not come back.

Science may do Evil as Well as Good

All of us rejoice in the achievements of physical science in doing good in the world. It has mitigated many evils and has brought to our doors many positive benefits. Science has discovered many remedies for diseases that in bygone days became epidemics. Still, as some has said, science may furnish means for multiplying evil. It cannot cure the moral sore of the world, but may greatly aggravate it. A writer in *Scribner's Magazine* for March says: "Science is spiritually bankrupt in the midst of its material triumphs; for science lends her services to the warmonger, the racketeer, the concocter of fiendish drugs as serenely as to the humanitarian." The best way is for science and religion to work together for the temporal, moral and spiritual well-being of the race.

Sin an Outstanding Fact

Why try to ignore it? Why seek to extenuate it? Why make the vain effort to beflower it? One of our contemporaries puts it pointedly in this way: "Merely dropping the word 'sin' from our vocabulary does not and cannot banish the ugly fact which the word represents. We have but to read the headlines of our metropolitan newspapers for a short time to realize that moral evil has a very real and terrible place in the world today, and those who seek to ignore it are simply living in a fool's Paradise."

The Total Doctrine always Best

In a liberalistic book on *The Philosophy of Prayer*, lying on the desk before us, we read the following: "The world may get beyond thinking of God as King, because it has ceased to think in terms of kingship;

but we cannot conceivably reach a condition of existence where we may cease to think in terms of fatherhood." Here is proof again that, whenever a Modernist tries to doctor up a Biblical doctrine, he pares it down, narrows it, contracts it. A Modernist is never as broad as is the teaching of the Bible on any doctrine. Anent the point raised, the Bible teaches that God is *both* King and Father, just as He ought to be. He ought to be the Sovereign over the universe which He has created—the just and holy Ruler. How else could the universe be rightly governed? Surely we human beings could not rule over the sun, moon and stars and the whole world of humanity. Therefore Paul was right when he called God "the King eternal, immortal, invisible" (1 Tim.1:17) and "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords" (1 Tim.6:15). But the Bible teaches that this great King is also our Father. What could be better than that—more comforting, more inspiring! Yes, the God depicted in the Bible is just what God ought to be—the Father-King of mankind and of the universe. He is not *either-or*, but *both*. The Bible ever teaches the all-sided doctrine.

Authority and Spirit

Another instance of modernistic contraction occurs when men try to set up "the religion of the spirit" against "the religion of authority." In Biblical teaching, the two are not mutually exclusive, but are both true and necessary. Note the broadness of Paul. He says: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." But he said just as positively: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." With Paul the religion of divine authority never came into conflict with the religion of the spirit and of liberty. He recognized the authority of God. But God by His Spirit has given us the Bible; therefore the Bible is our divine authority. And those persons who are regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Spirit through the Word of God as their authority are the freest persons on the earth. "If ye abide in my words," said Jesus, "ye shall be my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Let us thank God that the Bible, properly correlated and interpreted, never gives us mere partial truth, as do human rationalists, but the total truth.

The Bible Confirmed by Science

W. Bell Dawson, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.

The Lord by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding hath He established the heavens.—Proverbs 3:9.

Canst thou by searching find out God?—Job 11:7.

IN these days everything is open to discussion; and the foundations of knowledge, in every department where anything is known, are being inspected to see what groundwork they rest upon. Nothing seems to escape this critical investigation; the basis of science, and even religious belief, do not escape; and we are told that all our cherished views on any subject must give way before it. In these circumstances, when any book appears which deals with anything seriously, the reader and the reviewer look it over with the question: What is the attitude of this author; and what is he trying to prove? It is very necessary therefore to make this clear at the outset.

In looking into the relation between Science and the Bible the first thing needed is to explain what we mean by Science and how we regard the Bible. In every branch, that is entitled to be called science, there are always two sides or aspects; first, to ascertain the facts of the matter by careful

The Bible Confirmed By Science

CHRISTIAN Faith and Life is printing in this issue the first chapter of a work by W. Bell Dawson, the son of the distinguished geologist of the same name. Dr. Dawson is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada and a Laureat of the Academy of Paris as well as a member of many other learned and distinguished bodies. It is with distinct pleasure that we announce the appearing of this series of articles by this learned scientist and Bible lover. Dr. Dawson is a Canadian, residing at Montreal, Canada.—*Editor.*

observation and investigation, and to classify these facts in relation to their governing laws; and second, to infer the causes or reasons why things act as they do. We can see this distinction in the opening intelligence of the child. It begins by establishing a basis of fact by examining with its hands, teeth and taste, everything it can reach; and as soon as it can ask questions, it wants to know why and how, in regard to all that it sees going on around it. We find these two aspects of fact and theory in all branches of Science, from the investigation of the physical and material onward to the study of living things, and even in the attempt to understand our own mind which thinks everything out.

It is reasonable, therefore, to say that the basis or subject matter with which Science deals is Nature in its widest meaning; if we include in nature all that has material existence, together with plant and animal life, as well as the forces associated with these. All our scientific knowledge is built upon what we find in nature in this broad sense. We must be careful, however, to distinguish between true knowledge obtained by research and investigation, and the theories of science which may be largely speculative; and, indeed, they often go entirely beyond the proper domain of science into the philosophy of life. The advocates of such theories try to obtain acceptance for them by the claim that they are scientific and the outcome of science.

In dealing with the Bible, our attitude in what we here discuss, is to take the Bible just as it stands, and look into what it actually says; instead of regarding it from the viewpoint of some preconceived theory. The theory much favored at present is that religious ideas originated in fear and superstition, which resulted in nature-worship; and that men after groping their way through superstition and idolatry for centuries, at last came to see that there must be only One God. If we take such a view in dealing with the Scriptures it evidently becomes impossible to compare the Bible with science or with anything else; because we would not be basing the comparison upon what the Bible itself really says. The opening chapter of the Bible states in the clearest way that there is only One God; and the Bible depicts the First man as having direct intercourse with his Maker, so that according to Scripture he could not have begun with nature-worship and idolatry. The Apostle Paul, who was a learned scholar, shows his accord with the earlier Scriptures when he states that man originally "knew God," and degenerated from that knowledge into idolatry (Rom. 1:21-23).

It must surely be clear, even to those who are unwilling to accept these statements of Scripture as true, that we cannot do otherwise than what we here explain. For if we begin by discrediting the Scriptures, and maintaining that they ought to say something else than what they do say; and try to compare the conceptions thus arrived at with theories that are said to be the outcome of science we could only expect to lose ourselves in a tangled maze of discussion. If it were even the Koran or the Hindu Vedas that we were comparing with the findings of science, we would surely try to understand exactly what these ancient writings state, without first subjecting them to destructive criticism, so that what they do say becomes meaningless.

Another feature of the Bible which is extremely helpful, from our present standpoint, is its consistent unity throughout. This is indeed most remarkable when we consider that its writing extends over some sixteen centuries at least. Yet none of the later writers, in New Testament times, ever treat the earlier statements of the Bible as crude and primitive ideas which later knowledge has superseded. They invariably quote the Old Testament back to its very beginning as permanent truth which stands for all time. The Lord Jesus Himself takes the same attitude towards Moses and the Prophets. In some of its higher teaching the outward form or clothing of the truth may change; ceremony may be laid aside when its realization is accomplished; but the truth itself is the same. In quoting therefore from any part of the Bible to compare what is said with scientific knowledge we have never to face the difficulty that this may be contradiction or superseded somewhere else in the Scriptures. The whole difficulty in this matter is on the side of science; for in referring to scientific works we always need to ask: Is this still held to be correct? Even since the beginning of the present century there has been a complete change of outlook on such foundational matters as the nature of the elements, and profound biological questions; which affect several of the leading sciences.

What we have here said refers chiefly to what may be called the outward aspects of

the Bible; apart from its revelation of moral truth, the true character of God, and His plan for bringing man into relation with Himself. Such themes rise entirely above any realm that science can reach. To the present writer the Bible is a revelation from God of these higher truths, and of salvation through Christ. From a life-long study of the Scriptures he is also convinced that in every subject which they touch upon, their every word is reliable, and deserves consideration; and this can only mean that they were written under Divine supervision and guidance. Instead of criticising, therefore, we may question the Bible as we question nature, by asking: Why is this said, and why are we *not* informed about that? For every word has its meaning and purpose. In like manner if we criticise nature we get nowhere. To say that the sun ought to be red, or that grass should not be green, is futile; but if we ask: Why is grass green? we are led into the most fruitful lines of investigation, even to the very depths of biological chemistry.

In perusing the present pages we would ask the reader to take the Bible as it stands, and to look into what it actually says; leaving all criticism and theories aside. Also, with equal freedom from preconceived views, to listen to Science while it declares what it has discovered and what it really knows; apart from theories which may prove to be unfounded. If we thus let the Bible speak for itself, we will be in a position to compare it with modern knowledge with some hope of enlightenment. We may thus find in the end, that the portrayal of nature and of man as set before us in the Scriptures, is not only corroborated by all that is most reliable in science; but that by accepting what the Bible states, we will invariably be pointed to the right road, and kept from the paths of error, in our advance in knowledge.

I—The Creation

We may well take, as a starting point, the opening chapters of the Bible, in which the creation is depicted to us; and in doing so we may consider primarily the great moral purpose which such an account of the origin of the world, and of man, carries with it; even if we do not examine in detail the various stages in creation which it sets before us. It stands as the most noble and exalted opening to be found in any of the Sacred Books of the religions in the world. We do not have as an introduction, the opinions of the various sages with a discussion of which is most acceptable; nor do we find any admixture of the grotesque and irrational, such as occur in all the ancient mythological accounts of the creation, outside of the Bible. We may readily understand the impression that this makes on the Oriental mind, accustomed to finding religion based on philosophical dissertations and the crudities of mythology. We are told of a Brahmin in India who happened to see a Bible, and on reading the opening verses, he was so impressed that he wished to know more of a religious literature that opened so sublimely; and he was led on eventually to Christian belief.

It is very evident that the account of the creation in Genesis gives us the three basic conceptions, or foundation stones, on which true religion must be built. We find there: (1) The true relation of God to nature and to man. From this there results: (2) an entire freedom from idolatry which makes material things into objects of worship, and uses superstitious means to avert evil. Also, (3) there is no place left for pantheism; which means that things had originally the power to develop themselves, and that the only divinity is the law and the life which is diffused throughout nature. When once it is understood that God is the personal Creator and Originator of all things, great vistas of darkness and misconception are dispelled from the minds of men; for this enlightenment is a safeguard against the pitfalls of superstition and ignorance, as well as misleading theories in science itself.

The moral effect of this sound teaching regarding all that we see around us, is very far reaching; especially when we compare it with the superstition and idolatry which prevailed in the ancient world, and which still dominates the thought of the majority of mankind today. Modern science very rightly discountenances all superstitious views as contrary to the laws of nature; yet the teaching of science alone will not emancipate the heathen from their errors, nor will it enable the nations which think themselves more enlightened, to avoid a drift into materialism and even atheism. Both history and present experience show that the only real safeguard against superstition is the belief that one God is the Creator of all things; and this, also, is the overthrow of idolatry by making it irrational. For idolators are those who "worship and serve the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever"

(Romans 1:25). We may, therefore, perceive the object and purpose for which the work of God in creation is placed at the opening of the Scriptures, as a corner-stone in the foundation of truth.

Idolatry and its Tendencies. The advantage of this same outlook is all the more evident when we look into the course of idolatrous worship in history, and follow its inevitable tendency to degenerate into superstition on the one hand and moral degradation on the other. Superstition obscures the mind and prevents any true advance in knowledge on scientific lines; and decline in morals is subversive of true religion. The attractiveness of idolatrous practices seems to arise from two perverted views of well-being; first, because material advantages, good fortune and success, are made the chief aim in life; and secondly, because fear readily becomes dominant when once God as the supreme Ruler is lost sight of. We may say then in general, that the objects of idolatry are to secure good luck, good harvests, and all good fortune; and on the other hand, to avert evil, sickness and accident, and all things that are feared. We find this admitted even by the Hebrew people themselves when they fell into idolatrous ways, for they said: "We will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, to burn incense unto the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done...in the streets of Jerusalem; for then had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil." (Jeremiah 44:16-18.)

When the Israelites began their national career on leaving Egypt, where they had been so long surrounded with idolatrous practices, we find in the teaching given to them that God is set before them as the Supreme Giver of all good. If they serve the Lord and obey Him it will be well with them; they will dwell safely in their land, and be kept from disease; and verily they shall be fed. (See Exodus 15:26; Levit. 25: 18, 19; Psalm 37:3.) These promises of material blessings are much misunderstood and even criticised, by those who do not see that the cure for idolatry is the recognition of God as the Lord and Ruler of the world, who cares for those who trust Him. The lesson may be needful in our day, with its self-reliance and its self-seeking ways; for we may need to be reminded that "covetousness is idolatry," because it turns our minds from trust in God to reliance on our worldly possessions.

The worship of the moon and the sun were among the earliest forms of idolatry in Chaldea and Egypt. The worship of the sun we can understand, when it is so noticeable that its light and warmth make the crops grow, which furnish us with food. In the conceptions of idolatry, the sun must be propitiated to gain these advantages, as well as to avert its baleful influence, lest it should scorch up the harvest with drought. But why the moon was given the preference in Chaldea, is not so clear, unless it was due to the awed silence accompanying its worship, in the stillness of the night, which our poets often discourse upon. We may thus see in moon-worship the element of fear; but in neither of these cults does there seem to be anything of grateful adoration for benefits received.

How remarkable is the contrast of all such ideas and the elaborate ceremonial built upon them, with the simple statements in Genesis. They declare the sun and the moon to be the works of God and to have come into being in the heavens for purposes which their Creator had in mind. For they were not only to give light upon the earth, but they were also to serve to define the seasons, and for days and years. (See Genesis 1:14-16.) We may therefore study these bodies scientifically as much as we please, and utilize them as they were intended, for the measurement of time and to define periods of months and years, which the nations from the earliest times have done, in their various calendar systems.

There follows from the doctrine of creation a complete deliverance from the fear of evil from any natural source, which is so dominant a feature in all pagan religions. Science is at one with Scripture in its teaching that we should not be afraid of anything in the heavens above or on the earth beneath, because all things are under the dominance of law and order; yet science does not rise to the lofty conceptions of Scripture; nor does science safeguard us from a fatalistic view which may quite possibly arise if we lay undue stress on the idea that the laws of nature are fixed and unalterable. For he who believes in the Creator, the Lord who made heaven and earth, is delivered from fear by trusting His assurance: "The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night." He lives in safety from the "two great lights" that "rule the day

and rule the night," which the heathen fear and worship. And why? Not because he has brought some propitiatory offering in the silence of the night, not that he chants an incantation or wears a charm to avert lunacy or sunstroke. It is because: "The Lord is thy keeper; the Lord shall preserve thee." It is "His sun" that shines on high, as Christ tells us; and all things are under His control.* The only rational attitude, therefore, according to the Scriptures, is to look to Him, and to offer Him our gratitude and thanks for all the benefits we receive from the heavenly bodies; for this is due to Him who devised and arranged it all.

One God and Many gods. There are many in our day who would maintain that the conception of One God was only attained in later times, and that progress towards enlightened belief gradually took place; beginning with the lower forms of Fetishism, and going through Polytheism and Pantheism, till Monotheism was at last reached, and one God came to be worshipped. This is in keeping with the idea of a low grade of intelligence in early man. But the risk of being misled by such a view, we would escape by following Scripture. For it is quite disproved by the concurrent testimony of the prominent nations of antiquity which research is bringing to light.

In a recent article by Rev. Charles Neill, M.B., and the Reverend C. H. Titterton, M.A., the following summary on the question of the early belief of mankind is given:

> The Babylonians speak of *The God* whom they call *Anu,* although they fell over more and more into idolatry. The history and literature of India show us in the earliest period a close approximation to Monotheism; and this is followed by Pantheism, and then by Polytheism. The Chinese race invariably characterizes the earliest period of their history as pre-eminent above all others for its theoretical and practical ethics and religion. The ancient classics of China, like those of India, point to a Monotheistic period antecedent to Pantheism and Polytheism . . . Some also assert that the earliest Vedic hymns were Monotheistic in their expressions, and pointed to an early civilization and patriarchal life.†

Another well-informed writer says:

> The Egyptians were perhaps the most idolatrous nation of antiquity; yet the Egyptian papyri, published by the Trustees of the British Museum (in 1923) show that there existed very distinctly an early or occasional Monotheism in Egypt. (Quotations from the papyri follow to show this.)*

It is evident as we go onward through history, that instead of returning to the one God men show a continual tendency to multiply divinities. In addition to the sun and moon, the planets came to be objects of worship, especially among the later nations. The Greeks seem at first to have had some idea of a supreme deity; for in the early times of Homer, Zeus is called the father of gods and men, and the supreme ruler. As the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* remarks:

> Homer shows us . . . a certain hierarchy and family of divinities in which the supremacy of Zeus is established as incontestible . . . On the whole, the religious atmosphere (in the time of Homer) is freer than that of the later ages from the taint of magic and superstition.†

In the early times, also, the various aspects or sub-divisions of nature were all under the control of the one deity, and were regarded as his attributes. But in the fully developed mythology Zeus was only one among others; and he and his brothers distributed among themselves, by lot, the government of the universe. This gave each his own department, although there fell to Zeus the most important part.‡ With the Romans, Jupiter, who was the equivalent of Zeus, came to be merely the god of the weather. Of the other planets, Mars was the god of war; Venus was originally the goddess of the domestic virtues and the patron of family life; but her worship degenerated sadly into orgies in her honor. The various realms of nature and of life thus became subdivided, under the domination of different deities; and the sun and moon no longer held the supreme position (as in Chaldea and Egypt) while there was not yet much departure from the idea of One God.

On the moral side, the conditions resulting from idolatry were appalling. When the gods themselves were depicted as ignoring all standards of morality and decency, what could their worshippers become? Anyone at all acquainted with Classical literature and the vileness of its mythological divinities, will not consider the passage in the first chapter of Romans at all over-drawn. For idolators have "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like

*See Psalm 121; Genesis 1:16; Matthew 5:45.

†Address to university students; published in *The Biblical Recorder,* July 1, 1930; Sydney, Australia.

* Avary H. Forbes; article in *The Bible League Quarterly,* London; July-Sept. 1929.

† *Ency. Brit.* 11th Edition, 1929; article "Greek religion;" division: Homer and Post-Homeric Period.

‡ See Smith's *Smaller Classical Dictionary;* article "Zeus."

to corruptible man, to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts." This is the reaction and retribution which inevitably ensues. (See Romans 1:18-25.)

Another outcome of idolatry rises into prominence when the planets were added to the gods worshipped. Since the planets move among the stars, instead of remaining fixed like the others, great importance came to be attached to their position, which was supposed to have its influence on the fate of human beings, and to enable forecasts of their fortunes to be made. Upon the various positions of the planets, in relation to the fixed stars and to one another, the elaborate system of astrology was built up. In its language, "to be born under a lucky star" meant being born when some planet was at the time, in a specially favorable position. This development in pagan worship is noteworthy, as it shows how closely that worship was associated with the idea of obtaining good fortune.

It is thus surely evident that idolatry, and the superstitions to which it leads, are thoroughly unscientific, as well as contrary to Scripture. The conceptions of idolatry create an atmosphere in which no science can thrive.

The Scriptural view. When we turn from all these misconceptions to the Bible, we find an illumination which breaks through the fogs of ignorance and superstition, and throws light on the path of true science. Many of the ablest scientists of the past, who were pioneers in astronomy and geology, have gladly followed this light, But on the other hand, if a personal Creator is not recognized, the way lies open for wanderings among inconclusive theories which are as futile as mythology itself. And the Scriptures maintain that there is adequate evidence of a Creator: "From the very creation of the world, His invisible perfections —namely, His eternal power and divine nature—have been perceptible and clearly visible from His works, so that they are without excuse;" and because of not acknowledging Him, "they have become absorbed in useless discussions, and their senseless minds darkened." (Romans 1:20, 21, Weymouth's translation; 1926.)

In the endeavor to find some way by which the degradation of heathenism and superstition can be overcome, we are not merely engaged in an academic discussion regarding the mythologies and the philosophies of the past. For it is a pressing problem of the present, since about two-thirds of the human race are still under the dominance of idolatry and fatalism. Will it serve to offer these pagan populations Evolutionary theories, Agnosticism, or Atheism itself, as a substitute; or have these the power to check the drift in any country towards material success as the only worthwhile aim in life, for which "religion" is not needed?

The Scriptures show us that the really effective way to begin, is to set God before men as a personal Creator; from which it follows that all men are responsible to do His will, and to obey Him. It is announced to "all peoples that on earth do dwell," that "the Lord He is God; it is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves." When the Apostle Paul faced the learned Athenians, he began by proclaiming unto them the One God, who made the world (the *cosmos*) and all things therein, as well as all nations of men. This he made the introduction to repentance, and belief in Christ, whom God raised from the dead. (See Acts 17:22-31.)

It is evident that true science has the same aim as the Bible—to enlighten mankind. The scientist may well appreciate, therefore, the higher light which radiates from the Scriptures, which show themselves able, where both philosophy and science have fallen short, to dispel effectively the darkness of idolatry and superstition. The Bible, in a single sentence, disposes of the whole scheme of planetary divinities and the astrology associated with them; for we are told that God not only created the sun and the moon, but "He made the stars also." They are His, not independent deities; nor can they send down upon the inhabitants of the earth influences for good or ill, as astrology supposes.

The heavenly bodies are not to be worshipped, for they point beyond themselves to their Maker: "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork." Neither are they to be regarded with superstitious awe, because: "Thus saith the Lord, Learn not the way of the heathen, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed at them." It is the same on earth; and the mariner need not call upon the god of the sea, or look to propitious stars to help him; for the sea belongs to God. "The sea is His, and He made it...Thou rulest

the raging of the sea; when the waves thereof arise, Thou stillest them." (Psalm 19:1; Jeremiah 10:2; Psalms 95:5 and 89:9.)

Such Scriptures reveal to us a clear and acceptable explanation for the unity of nature, and the co-operation of the forces of nature with each other; without which the stars would wander from their places and harvests would not grow. For God as the Creator has devised the whole, and correlated all things as parts of one great design. Surely, such a presentment of this as we find it in the Bible, cannot be deemed irrational; and it is helpful to honest research in science, apart from the theories which make bold to claim scientific support, because unsound views of nature are thereby set aside, which are always obstructions to real progress in knowledge.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the Bible discourages learning and investigation, for, in reality, it is superstition which thrives upon ignorance. Yet the Bible is accused of standing in the way of progress in thought. It may not go out of its way to give us scientific information, but it has no fault to find with the pursuit of knowledge, for many of the leading characters in Scripture were men of learning. Moses was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." Solomon's wisdom "excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country;" and he was wiser than all the wise men of his time, whose names are mentioned. He not only "spake three thousand proverbs" and composed songs, but he was also a naturalist; for "he spake of trees, from the cedar tree even unto the hyssop;...he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes;" and the Scriptures commend this, for it is said that his wisdom and understanding were given him of God. (I Kings 4:29-34.) Daniel, when he was taken to Babylon as a young man, was one of those who were "skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science," and he was selected to be taught "the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans." (Daniel 1:3,4.) The Apostle Paul was recognized to be a learned man; for it was said to him in reproach: "Thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad." (Acts 26:24.)

These outstanding personalities in Bible times do not feel themselves to be under any restriction in the investigation of nature, or other sources of knowledge; but against idolatry and the degrading superstitions that go with it, there is everywhere in Scripture the sternest denunciation. In this attitude genuine science can heartily concur.

Montreal, Canada

A Modernist Crux

HERBERT W. MAGOUN, PH.D. (J.H.U.)

THERE is, perhaps, no paragraph in any literature that has been more often or more vigorously assailed than the testimony of Josephus concerning Jesus. The modernists simply will not believe that he could have written as he did, in spite of the fact that every extant manuscript of his work is said to contain the passage intact. How that could have happened, if it is not genuine, they do not deign to explain. Nor do they seem to realize what their disbelief involves. It is an admirable illustration of the fact that when faith goes out at the door, credulity comes in at the window.

The paragraph in question is the third section of the third chapter of the eighteenth book of his *Antiquities of the Jews,* and it follows an account of the opposition of the Jews to certain plans of Pilate. As commonly quoted, it reads:

> Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the prinicpal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him: for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day. (Whiston's Translation).

This rendering is rather free, and it fails to bring out some details. It is also a bit misleading. For that reason the version of Eusebius is given below.

To consistently reject the passage, one must believe that Christian scoundrels managed to secure every copy of the work long after it was written and necessarily long after many men had had a chance to read it, that they then in some way hard to believe

managed to smuggle in this paragraph in part or in whole—it is too long for any marginal note—so that it became a part of the text too apparently genuine to be expurgated as spurious, that they then in a manner not disclosed somehow managed to put the manuscripts back where they belonged, and that the whole thing was done with such fineness that the fraud was not even suspected, no man being keen enough or with a good enough memory to discover the tampering. Verily, the credulous among scholars are not all dead, the vastness of the credulity of some of them being astounding.

There appears to be no evidence that any one ever questioned the passage, until Scaliger (1540-1609) came onto the stage. He seems to have been possessed of a passion for emending ancient texts, and that was probably the true source of his tampering with Josephus in this connection. The paragraph offered him tempting material to question, and he took the opening. He was long considered an "ultimate authority;" but his results are now questioned, and some of them are seen to be mere blundering. His self-confidence and his "superiority complex" were neither of them conscipuous for their absence, and his strictures on this passage of Josephus have been given altogether too much weight. Moreover, as indicated, they involve too many impossibilities.

When the "will not to believe" gets possession of a man, it is amazing how easy it is for him to believe something else that is far more improbable. For some reason his native common sense, if he has any, suffers an inhibition that makes him dumb and blind to obvious absurdities, and he swallows the most improbable conjectures without ever batting an eyelash, just because they happen to fit into his ideas of what ought to be the truth. That it is not, makes no difference whatever. Convinced against his will, he will be of the same opinion still and a little more so than he was before.

That is the sort of thing that has repeatedly taken place in connection with this passage. No defense of it seems to be effective with some minds. It carries with it certain unwelcome evidences of the truth of things that men of the "modern" type do not care to accept, and that settles the matter. They will not believe, and they still continue to seek for ways in which to discredit the passage as a whole or, at least, such parts of it as they do not like.

One argument advanced against it is pure assumption. Just because Origen did not happen to mention the matter, it has been asserted that the paragraph was unknown to him and the early church fathers. The omission proves nothing, and the assumption was really a boomerang. Origen is supposed to have died in 253 A.D. Josephus wrote between 70 and 95 A.D. For at least two hundred and fifty years, then, men had had a chance to read what he had to say. With ancient memories as tenacious as those of our educated blind men, is it believable that no one could be found who would detect any tampering with the text? Consider the unreasoning hostility of the Roman world to the Christian sect. Has that no place in the premises? Was there no Jew who knew enough about Josephus and his work to recognize any such change as either of those postulated?

Furthermore, Eusebius, born in 264 A.D., not only knew of the passage but quoted it twice, one of the quotations being part of an effort to prove to Jews that Jesus was the Christ. That implies that if Origen did not know of it, along with all the other early church fathers, it must be inferred that somewhere within fifty years after his death a forgery was perpetrated and that the said forgery was accepted by Eusebius as a genuine part of the text of Josephus. Do you imagine that Eusebius himself was the forger and that he then quoted the passage as genuine? How could he use it as he did, unless it was genuine?

By what possible stretch of the imagination can any one believe that Christian men became literary rogues so unutterably clever that they could foist a paragraph like that upon a hostile world, cover up their tracks so completely that not a soul, Roman or Jewish, would ever discover a trace of their work, and thus escape the howl of protest that was bound to arise over any such high-handed performance by a hated sect? Can you make a thing like that seem probable? You must, if you are to accept the views of a modernist.

Could Eusebius pretend that the passage was there and thus get it in on a manuscript margin as if it belonged in the text, regardless of its length? Do scribes accidentally omit whole paragraphs in copying? Words and lines they do omit; but ancient conservatism would prevent the omission of a paragraph, unless it was done with malice afore-

thought. That sort of thing was possible; but insertions and deliberate changes in texts had absolutely no chance to escape detection at the hands of those who were acquainted with the original.

Now, note another thing. Eusebius does not quote Josephus exactly. He inserts a preposition meaning "from," changes the order of three words, says "many of the Jews" instead of "many Jews," and shows a slight variation in connection with the use of an article. Such things indicate a quotation from memory, which was the regulation way in early times. Men did not consult books, because books were too scarce. They read a book once and remembered what they read almost *verbatim*. Perhaps you doubt that. Well, I have known three such persons myself, and we have enormous amounts to remember where they had but little. Blind men do it constantly. My three could all see.

What was it that Josephus said? The quotation in Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History*, i. 11, 7f.) is so nearly exact that it may be well to use it for a reason soon to appear. The words mean:

> Having narrated these things about John, he has also made mention of our Saviour in the course of the same historical narrative of his book about as follows: "But in the course of this time there is born Jesus, a wise man, if to call him a man is right; for he was a doer of marvelous works, a teacher of men, those who receive the truth with pleasure, and many indeed of the Jews, but many also of the Greeks he brought over *to himself*. The 'Christos,' this was. And him, on *the* evidence of the men first amongst us, Pilate having condemned to the cross, those who loved *him* at the start did not cease *to do so*. For he appeared to them, holding to *the* third day, again living, the holy prophets both these and countless other wonderful *things* concerning *him* having told. And even yet, now, the race of Christians, named from this *man*, fails not."

Words in italics are glosses inserted to make the sense clear. The translation has been made quite literal purposely. The quotation marks on Christos are inserted as necessary to indicate the correct meaning of Josephus. If we include Joshua, Son of Nun, he has over a dozen men by the name of Jesus, and he identifies each and every one of them in some way. This one was the one called Christos. He never fails to designate each man by something that settles his identity, and he must have done the same thing here.

To assume that he is confessing that Jesus was the Christ, as has been done often in the past, is to miss the point entirely. If he had intended to do that, he never would have used the pronoun that he did. It often expresses contempt. There is another that is used to express admiration and therefore approval; but he did not use it here, preferring to use one that in no way indicated approval on his part. Why has no notice been taken of that fact?

Several things should now be considered. In the Preface to his *Antiquities* (3, end) Josephus says:

> As I proceed therefore, I shall accurately describe what is contained in our records, in the order of time that belongs to them; for I have already promised so to do throughout this undertaking; and this without adding anything to what is therein contained, or taking away anything therefrom.—(Whiston's translation).

That the trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrin, his condemnation, and crucifixion, were in no manner recorded in Jerusalem is beyond belief; but if they were recorded, Josephus knew something about that record. Tacitus bears witness to the execution by Pontius Pilate (*Annals*, xv. 44), and it must have been noted in public documents. There was also the persistent claim that Jesus had risen from the dead, it was never refuted, the empty tomb was there, no body was ever produced by the authorities, the Jews concocted a story to the effect that the body was concealed in the bed of a stream, and the disciples publicly declared in the most positive way that Jesus had arisen from the dead. To suppose that a man of the sort that Josephus plainly was would know nothing of these things is to show a naïveté worthy of something quite different from a scholar.

For fully twenty-five years after these events, or until Josephus was near the end of his teens, the activities of the native Christian church in Jerusalem, the persecutions of Christians there and elsewhere, and the resulting excitement of the population, furnished material to stir the interest of any boy, and Josephus was no common lad. To imagine that he did not hear all about what had happened, or paid no attention, if he did hear, is, again, to be extremely credulous, to say the least.

Josephus was naturally fair minded, he made a trial of the different sects of his race, he had a tenacious memory, he also had an inquiring turn of mind, and he lived in both Jerusalem and Galilee. His people did not believe the stories told of Jesus; but they were told just the same, and the boy must

have been filled with wonder at them and been puzzled by them. Naturally, being of priestly descent, he did not feel inclined to accept the tale of a risen Lord; but he could not dodge it for all that, and he must have known all about it. He therefore had to notice it in some way; but he said just as little as he possibly could and kept his word to tell everything.

At the close of his *Antiquities* (xx.11,2), he makes this emphatic statement:

> And I am so bold as to say, now I have so completely perfected the work I proposed to myself to do, that no other person, whether he were a Jew or a foreigner, had he ever so great an inclination to it, could so accurately deliver these accounts to the Greeks, as is done in these books. For those of my own nation freely acknowledge, that I far exceed them in the learning belonging to Jews; I have also taken a great deal of pains to obtain the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language. (*Whist. trans.*).

In the very next paragraph he adds the statement that there are those still living who can either prove that what he says is false or attest that it is true. There undoubtedly were just such people. They knew all about this particular story too, and they knew as well that Jesus "held to" the third day. He had promised to rise on the third day, and He kept his word. Josephus even recognizes that fact in a covert way, putting the matter so briefly that the reference has excited no notice and no comment.

But Josephus has something else to say in his *Antiquities* (xx.9,1), and Eusebius quotes that also (*Eccles. Hist.*, ii, 23, 22) as follows:

> Ananus (Annas) II convened a sanhedrin of judges, and bringing stealthily into it the brother of Jesus, the Christos so-called—James *was* his name —and certain others, he handed *them* over to justice to be stoned, having made up an accusation as if *they were of those* transgressing the law.

The mood implies that Annas concocted the accusation himself. The translation is again quite literal; for accuracy, not elegance, is the thing sought after.

Going back now for a moment, let it be observed that Eusebius quotes a passage concerning John just before he quotes the one about Jesus. The passage concerning John has never been questioned, this one is given with the same assurance, the two are not found in the same connection but are both of the same general character in the eyes of Eusebius, both were accepted by the church fathers without question, the one about Jesus was quoted by Jerome (340-420 A.D.), by Isodorus (560-636 A.D.), by Cassiodorus (468-560 A.D.), and some others, as well as by Eusebius (264-349 A.D.), and there appears to be no evidence whatever that any of these men ever questioned its genuineness.

Eusebius certainly did not, when he quoted it to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Christ, their Messiah. In the passage cited above, he does not pretend to quote Josephus exactly; for he says "about as follows." That implies that the passage was familiar to others and that they would know that it was not quoted with perfect accuracy. His attitude, in short, is that of a man using an unquestioned and authoritative historical statement which his readers would promptly accept at its face value.

In the quotation concerning James (the Greek has Jacob), the order of the words in Josephus is slightly different, meaning "the so-called Christos" rather than "the Christos so-called," or "the one called Christ;" for that rendering is allowable in the version of Eusebius, although it is less exact. We seldom keep the color of the original in a translation, because it is an extremely difficult thing to do. Any attempt to do it is apt to be criticized as a poor translation, while a "good translation" may be decidedly misleading. The point of view is usually changed for the worse by the "goodness."

Just before the statement in Eusebius concerning James, he has another (*Eccles. Hist.*, 23, 20), in which he says:

> Assuredly, at least, even Josephus does not hesitate to appeal to this in writing, through *the* words which he says, "And these *things* have happened to *the* Jews in the course of an avenging of James, the Just, who was *the* brother of Jesus the so-called Christos, since undoubtedly, *though* being a most just *man*, the Jews slew him."

While it is not clear just where Eusebius found his passage, it is in keeping with the style of the historian, and it corresponds to other statements of his. It is therefore probably genuine, and its omission from an extant work could be easily accounted for, since it is brief, would not be easily missed, and was of such a character that Jews and Romans both would be glad to be well rid of it.

The order of the words respecting Jesus is that which Josephus uses elsewhere, and the sentiments expressed plainly tally with his other teachings. Even if the statement originated from some manuscript with such a note on the margin, it may have been an insertion from the hand of Josephus himself,

added in some connection as an afterthought. It has the earmarks of genuineness, and it can therefore be accepted as the opinion of the historian.

The Jews have always been sensitive about such accusations, and Jewish scribes could be trusted to get rid of this brief statement, if the thing were in any way possible. The omission could be made with the utmost ease, and if any criticism arose because of it, the excuse was always available that it was the result of an oversight. It could be put back on the margin; but the chances are that it never would be, since it was unpalatable to begin with. The rendering has again been made quite literal to preserve the flavor of the original.

That Josephus actually wrote the passage is made probable by two facts: he says in his *Antiquities* (XVIII. v. 2):

> Now, some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment for what he did against John, that was called the Baptist, for Herod slew him, who was a good man, etc.—(Whiston's translation).

And he also says at the end of his *Wars of the Jews* (VII. xi. 5):

> Of which history, . . . as for the agreement with the facts, I shall not scruple to say, and that boldly, that truth hath been what I have alone aimed at through its entire composition.—(Whiston's translation).

Elsewhere, he claims, in his *Against Apion* (I. 10), that he has superior knowledge of the matters of which he treats, and his claim is just.

As to his criticizing his people, he does it elsewhere. When he saw that the Jewish cause in Galilee was hopeless, he promptly abandoned it and went over to the Romans, and when he saw that the city was doomed, he did his best to persuade the people to surrender and save the city. He chronicles his words in his *Wars* (VI. ii.) and then goes on to explain the madness of the populace. Many heeded his words and fled to the Romans; but the rest seemed possessed, even when those who had deserted begged them to desist and surrender.

In the course of his explanation, Josephus says:

> But now, what did the most elevate them in undertaking this war, was an ambiguous oracle that was found also in their sacred writings, how, "about that time one from their country should become governor of the habitable earth." The Jews took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular, and many of the wise men were thereby deceived in their determination. Now, this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed emperor in Judea.—(Whiston's translation, *Wars*, VI. v. 4.)

It has been inferred from this statement that Josephus regarded Vespasian as the Messiah; but Josephus never uses the term Messiah, and to suppose that he would apply a distinctively Jewish epithet to a Roman requires a somewhat active imagination. It merely illustrates, however, how far afield a wrong conception can take even a scholar of unusual attainments, when he begins to distrust the Bible.

Josephus remembered the doom that had been pronounced against Israel, he recognized the signs of its coming, he sought with groans and tears to avert it (*Wars*, VI. ii. 1f.; v. 3), and concludes (ib. 4) by saying, "However, it is not possible for men to avoid fate, although they see it beforehand." He adds that they interpreted things as they pleased.

But there is more to be said concerning what has preceded. To begin with, the passage concerning Annas is not questioned, and the form of the statement is not criticised; and yet, if the passage concerning Jesus is not genuine, the form of statement used must be explained. If Josephus had not previously had something to say of the Jesus who was called the Christ, he never would have referred to him in this casual way as some one already mentioned. He might do a thing of that sort in giving a proper name like Joshua Son of Nun; for such names in the Hebrew Bible are patronymics, not records of descent, and the fact ought to be recognized. Our translators have been at fault. In the case of Jesus, however, no ordinary method of identification was employed, and Josephus must have previously made the matter clear or he would have been less casual here.

A person known as the Christos could not be entirely ignored in his story of events; for to do that would have been to break his promise to tell all. If, however, any part of the paragraph is admitted as genuine all of it must be; for only a believer could have desired to add the statement that He rose from the dead and "held to" the third day, and believers could not do a thing like tampering with another's manuscripts and still keep their vows. This is made clear by a letter of Pliny the younger to Trajan ("Letters" X. xcvii. or "Trajan" xcvi.), in which

he declares that the Christians of his day met regularly on a stated day before light and bound themselves by an oath not to be guilty of fraud, theft, or adultery, and never to falsify their word, or deny a trust.

It thus appears that the supposition that Christian miscreants made an interpolation of any sort in all the extant manuscripts of Josephus then in existence involves an inconsistency far greater than any that Josephus could possibly have been guilty of by writing the passage just as it stands. He knew the story and recorded it in as few words as possible. He says specifically ("Life," 65) that he has something to say to "others who profess to write history, but have little regard to truth, and are not afraid, . . . to relate falsehoods." That binds him to tell the truth exactly and in full.

He also testifies (*Against Apion,* I. 9) that he gave copies of his history of the war to many Romans who had been in it and sold many to those of the Jews who had a knowledge of Greek philosophy. It follows that copies of his "Antiquities" must have been multiplied to some extent and therefore read and remembered by both Jews and Romans. The difficulties of making any interpolation in them were therefore so great, not to say that the idea is preposterous, that it may fairly be said to have been impossible.

Eusebius certainly considered the passage genuine from start to finish; for, otherwise, he never could have quoted, in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* (iii.3,105f.), these words of Josephus in an effort to convince the Jews of the truths of Christianity. That he did so is unquestioned; but he could not do so, unless he was sure that Josephus himself penned the entire account as it now stands. That he did so seems to be incontrovertible.

It now seems likely that Origen correctly evaluated the testimony of Josephus and, knowing that he did not accept Jesus as the Messiah, did not think it necessary to mention him as a defender of the faith. He certainly was a follower of truth, though not a follower of Jesus, and, as such, he had to tell what Jewish records like those found in Matthew, Mark, and John had to say. That he knew nothing of the gospel records is hardly believable, considering his times and his character. If he made trial of all the Jewish sects as he states that he did (*Life,* 2), it can hardly be supposed that he took no interest in the teachings of Christian believers. All Jews did that to some extent.

This is shown in the references to Jesus in the Talmud and especially in a scurrilous pamphlet called *A History of Jesus* (*Toldoth Jeshu*). No attempt whatever is made anywhere to deny that He worked miracles. In fact it is openly admitted that He cured lepers and raised the dead; but it is asserted that He did these things with the help of secret magic, using *ha Shem,* "the Name," for that purpose.

Nor is his character assailed beyond a mere claim that He failed to show proper respect to some Elders. His birth alone is attacked, and all the bitterness that hate could muster is put into that attack. He is thus put beyond the pale as an illegitimate son, a *mamzer,* and one conceived in uncleanness. That proves pretty conclusively that the Jews knew the story of his birth, did not believe it, and put their own construction on the facts.

Although Josephus does not mention the matter in any way, it has been assumed, in an attempt to account for his words, that he had it in mind and thus associated it with the story that follows concerning the way in which Decius Mundus outwitted Paulina and humiliated her. The inference is that he knew the story found in the *Toldoth Jeshu* of how Mary was outwitted and forced, and that he put the two together as parallel narratives. Perhaps he did know that story and think of it; but if he did it was probably only one of those things that happen when a man is puzzled by something and seeks for an explanation. The reason that he gives for relating what he does is the fact that the events he mentioned happened at about the same time as the birth of Jesus.

As to the final statement in his account, it is clear that he must have been well acquainted with Isaiah, and things in that prophet fit so well into the story of Jesus that young rabbis are advised not to read him lest they become "turncoats," or *meshummads.* A "Scape-goat Messiah" has now been postulated to account for the teachings of Isaiah; but the Jews have never been able to conceive of a person who could combine their ideas of a Messiah king with any such thing as a "lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Josephus was "on the fence," he did not accept Christian teachings, but he did know about them and stated them in the fewest possible words. The passage is therefore genuine; for the supposition that it is not involves actual impossibilities.

Belmont, Massachusetts

The Fighter of Fairmount

CLARENCE TRUE WILSON, D.D., LL.D.

A PREACHER APPEARS

ANOTHER element was interjected when at the Wilmington Conference the Methodists assigned to Fairmount in March, 1880, a new pastor, in the person of Rev. John A. B. Wilson. He was only thirty. He had been a sailor in early life and the master of a sailing vessel at nineteen. He had been converted and was a preacher on the 16-point circuit at twenty. He was married and had a family of three boys and his wife's two younger sisters. Cora and Sue. These all came into Fairmount on that memorable March night in the chill of a breaking winter and in the dark of a community that had never known the street lamp. They were met in the warm parsonage by as warm-hearted people as ever supported a minister in his benevolent and in his reformatory work for a community. They liked their ministers, especially if they did not run afoul of their politics and their superstitions. There were scarcely any people here who did not believe in ghosts and a man who hadn't seen one or two, or a dozen, in his life was a dull neighbor; he had nothing of consequence to talk about. If a boy lost a tooth, he buried it deeply, for if a dog got it, he would have a dog tooth. If one of the children stuck a nail in his foot, they pulled the nail out and greased it. They didn't do anything to the foot. This careful greasing of the nail was to prevent lockjaw, and it always did it as I do not remember to have had any lockjaw after this treatment of the nail.

Very soon the community discovered that a pastorate of energy, force, vision, progressiveness and reform had been set up among them. This man actually called a negro man, "brother," and tipped his hat when he spoke to a negro woman. People began to pull off from him, but when openly questioned about this he said, "Do you think I am going to let a negro be more of a gentleman than I am?" A negro presiding elder came down to hold the colored quarterly conference. The white preacher was seen to take a long walk with him, locked arms, and when some of his church people said there was objection to this, he explained, "You see, Doctor Coffee is the own son of General William Coffee, the noted Virginia fighter! He understands Greek and Hebrew thoroughly; he was in college while I was in the forecastle or cabin. I have to pick up things like that wherever I can get them." Whenever a negro was arrested for assault and battery, Wilson would appear, and if he knew the man, he would testify to his good moral character—a thing that a white man had never done before under similar circumstances. He occasionally would go down and preach in the colored church, believing that his gospel would not be contaminated by its exposure to the color that predominated there. Whenever a question was in dispute regarding the rights of the weaker race he was generally for the weaker against the dominant one, and when a fight was to occur —being very handy with his fists—he has been known to step in and attack a dozen men when a forlorned negro boy was all there was on the other side. It was not long before his name, John A. B. Wilson, came to be shortened to J. A. B., and this was the favorite designation of the unregenerate of the community.

He discovered that some of the young men converted in his church were getting liquor. They learned that at a place called Jamestown there was a man by the name of Tom Dryden who ran a "blind-pig" establishment. The term, "bootlegger," was not then so popular and they called them "blind-pigs" and "blind-tigers." The preacher used to say that he preferred a blind-pig or a blind-tiger to one with both eyes open—especially if it was after his boy, but he didn't know why they should call an unlicensed liquor seller by the name of an animal—unless he be named a "skunk" which is the only animal that dispenses strong liquor without a license. So a young man of his Bible class went up and got plenty of evidence against this bootlegger in Jamestown, three miles north of the Methodist Church. To convict a man before that magistrate required a mathematical demonstration, an ocular revelation, an overwhelming list of witnesses and a group of determined spectators with fire in their eyes. The case was closed and the man who had been running on for years convicted, but Justice of the Peace Furnace withheld the sentence until the next day and sent word down that the sentence was $1.20 fine.

This put the preacher on his neck! The prayer meeting was held in the church as usual on Wednesday night and at its close the pastor said he would like to see all the men in his study for a minute. It was decided to go up and remove the building where the liquor was stored and being sold contrary to law. The men were to go and take the women home and assemble at the parsonage at eleven o'clock that night with their rigs and the twenty-five men would drive up to the bootlegging establishment, the pastor leading. A half mile before reaching the place they stopped, got out their axes and cut down a couple of trees. These trees were to be battering rams and in the swinging arms of twenty-five stalwart men were to batter that building into nonentity.

But the fighting parson was tender-hearted; always "putting himself in the other fellow's place." He began to think of the mother and children; so he said, "Men, you get the battering rams ready while I go up and get the mother and children out of the building." He knocked on the door. The woman came down and seeing his face exclaimed, "Oh, Mr. Wilson, I am so glad you came. My husband is very ill and I have felt like sending for you all evening. Won't you come upstairs and pray for my husband?" In two minutes the preacher is in the sick-room receiving the confessions of a man very ill. He asks for prayer. The pastor is on his knees by the bedside of the bootlegger. The man is genuinely penitent, and according to the old-established Methodist's faith and practice he is converted. He says, "I want you to help me roll the whiskey barrels out of my basement and have a bonfire; I am through with liquor selling forever." The fighting preacher calls his men together. They move the bar and cut it into kindling, knock out the bung hole and let the whiskey run down the ditches, and a bonfire blazed that could be seen for miles away, that was taken for a burning building or maybe the coming of the Judgment Day. It drew dozens of people beyond the midnight hour—not to see a battering ram destroy the home but to rejoice in the conversion of an illicit rum seller.

One of the things that had to be corrected in this neck of the woods was cruelty to animals. It is strange how "things" like that will grow.

> Vice is a monster of such frightful mein
> That to be dreaded needs but to be seen;
> Yet seen too oft—familiar with her face
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Anything in the world can exist anywhere until somebody stops it.

To see a sober man beat his horse, or a drunken man abuse dumb animals was common, where bad manners were cultivated and temper was supreme. The preacher spoke on love and compassion and mercy.

"Be good to the weak; help those who cannot help themselves; put yourself in the place of the speechless; and as they cannot tell you, ask yourself how you would like to be treated if you were they and they were you. Christians, be kind to your horse, for His sake who was not ashamed to have been born in a stable."

One Monday the preacher was walking up to the Post Office. A doctor, who must be nameless here, because the repetition of his name every time it must occur in this narrative would grow monotonous, drove up before the Post Office and his horse went a step too far, putting a foot on the store steps. With his full strength the doctor snatched the horse's mouth till it reared back, and then jerking the buggy whip, he lashed the helpless animal till the blood ran and great welts stood out on its sides and back. The preacher happened along in time to see this cruelty. He collared the doctor, snatching him from his buggy. He then gave him a big sample dose of the "feel" of that horse-whip, broke the whip to pieces, put the remains back in the buggy and announced that he had regular doses of such medicine for any man or number of men who abused a dumb animal.

The next day the preacher's conscience troubled him. He thought of that whip that cost money, and he had broken it. He resolved to pay for it, and walked up toward the doctor's stable. At his approach, the family physician, brave enough to shoot a colored mother, whipped out a revolver, took aim and said, "One more step toward me and you are a dead man." The parson did not even slacken his steps, but said, "Put that thing up, Doctor. I am not afraid of that. What I came for was to pay you for the whip I used up yesterday. If you will tell me what you paid for it, I will pay you." And as the money was being counted, the doctor named ten dollars, but added, "It was an old whip worth about five." This the preacher gladly paid, and another tragedy was averted.

But the horse deal and the whip episode had to be paid. What to do about this was a problem for the perplexed. Burn the

church? The church people are stronger than we. Burn the parsonage? That is a job that might start other fires—maybe a general conflagration. Beat up the preacher? That has been tried elsewhere and here and it had not been "healthy." Nearly a year passed. The preacher is going to Conference. He will be gone a week; he will leave his horse and buggy at home; the preacher's wife will accompany him; her two sisters will remain at home with the little children —four now, one a small baby. This will be our time to wreak vengeance. In the dead of night, with the pastor away for a week, the premises guarded only by two women and four children, "asleep," the heroes sneaked to the unguarded stable, led the pastor's horse out, cut her mane and tail off, shaved her in spots and painted her in as many stripes and colors as Joseph's coat. For this brave deed, done in the night while the pastor was a hundred and twenty miles away, there must have generated heroic and exultant feelings that would keep them proud through life, for that was nearly fifty years ago, and the perpetrators—several of them —are still living there.

These conditions did not put the preacher and the doctor of the community on very good terms. The other physician could have walked into universal practice, but he knew as little about which side his bread was buttered on as he knew about right and wrong, or about medicine. Meanwhile, people were dying of most anything. Who expected ever to get well of pneumonia, typhoid or intermittent fever, or diphtheria or scarlet fever? Send for the preacher and prepare for the funeral.

Most men would leave a condition like that; but not that preacher. He wrote to the President of Boston University, described the conditions of health and morals and said, "I am going to do the minister's part down here, but I need a trained, experienced and skillful physician. Won't you find one? I will guarantee his support." In a surprisingly short time Dr. Gill, of Boston, appeared. He was only to look over the field; but the pastor took him in a single day to see the sick,—fifteen patients his first day. He never got back to Boston. Incurable patients began to recover. He sent for his office furniture, and books and medical supplies. He was called for far and wide, by night and by day. He had all he could do. He wrote for a brother-in-law, another physician of the same school. They were both busy. Five-sixth of all cases of fever got well. We used to lose about that proportion. The preacher was now blessed not only as a soul saver, but as a life saver. There is more than one way in which an intelligent, progressive can help a conservative community.

When a year or two had passed and two hundred conversions and accessions to the church had accrued and a preacher, always forceful and interesting in the pulpit, was "holding forth," and it was whispered he was not to be trifled with, it grew "fashionable" to behave one's self in church. It was a long time since a rowdyism had disturbed public worship in Fairmount. But don't be too confident. The "caveman" is not sloughed off just by a year of good behaviour. "Angels of light are not made out of that material." "The Ethiopian cannot change his skin nor a leopard his spots."

One night the church was to have an elocutionary entertainment. Professor S. T. Ford, distantly related to the Fords of Fairmount, was to come down from New York for a recital. They were to charge admission. The tough crowd had been good as long as it could. "If we pay twenty-five cents and 'Jab' Wilson is not speaking himself, we can do what we please." Peanuts and pecans are purchased. They make such a delicious sound between the teeth at an "elocutionary entertainment," and the shells sound like fire crackers on the bare floor during the dramatic or pathetic parts of a selection. And the preacher will be looking the other way! He will never know who did it!

Four hundred people crowded the building. The elocutionist proceeded with his lighter numbers. Stiff paper would crumple, nuts were masticated, shells would crack, but it did not make much difference. Then a dramatic piece was rendered. You could hear a pin drop; pathos was interjected and feelings were tensed. Crack! Crack! went the nut shells on the floor. Everybody was disturbed, but the thoughtless boys and the giggling girls. The professor turned to the pastor a beseeching look and said, "I cannot go on; it is impossible to read such pieces in such disorder." The pastor in his most beguiling manner said, "Ladies and gentlemen, several hundred people have paid good money tonight to hear an elegant entertainment rendered by a gentleman of New York, a product of our own community. Any noise or disturbance annoys and robs of what they have paid to receive a whole community. I

hope there will not be a single act that will mar the pleasure of the occasion."

The effect of this speech reminds one that the scathing addresses of Sam Jones brought complaint as to his style of pulpit discourse. Some of the "objectors" came to him and said, "Why do you treat this community like a band of ruffians?" The Southern evangelist replied, "There has been an awful lot of fine preaching used up on you fellows, but it hasn't saved any of you yet."

Well, that fine little speech of Pastor Wilson was lost on the group for whom it was intended.

The professor went timidly on and midway a beautiful passage, crack, crack, went the nut shells on the floor and into the air flew the professor. "It is impossible to proceed with this entertainment amid such discourtesies." The preacher was on his feet. A silence that could be felt prevailed. "This is the second time we have asked for order," he said. "That disturbance had better not occur again." And a selection or two were rendered amid a silence profound.

A selection of rare beauty, a little too fine for the kind of folks who misbehave in church, came next. More chewing of nuts and crushing of shells. In desperation the elocutionist stops, with a pleading look toward the pastor. Over the platform, over the altar, down the aisle, swift as an eagle swoops upon its prey, quietly as a cat springs upon a mouse, the preacher reached for the throat of the disturber. With one hand thrust into his collar and one hand clutching the seat of his trousers, a big man boasting a hundred and eighty-five pounds of avoirdupois swung up into the air like a doll in the hands of a giant. The preacher marched in triumph the length of the church; the peanut eater, seven feet in air, airplaned out of the building; down the stairs they glided; and now how could the pastor put down his charge; he sat him down; on the top step he "settled" with a jar that shook the building. An earthquake was suggested. For a pacifist you need a Quaker, but this Methodist preacher was an earth-quaker!

The entertainment went on. But the brothers, and brothers-in-law and the cousins gathered outside, rode home for guns and pistols, and the question was, "Will the pastor come out the front door or slip through the back door into his home?" They didn't all know him yet, or there would have been no question. Against all entreaties, when the handshaking was over, the pastor offered his arm to the companion of his life, his two boys followed, his father who was visiting Fairmount, came with the girls, and we all walked slowly through the mob. There were threats on every side, a pistol or two in the air, but no damage. All were safely at home, but such courage as that is never discreet.

The preacher picked up his fifteen pound dumb-bell and started out to clear the road in front of his house, but a missile was hurled as he opened the door which gave him a goose-egg adornment on the side of his forehead for some weeks to come.

It was not six months before a great revival was on and nearly two hundred conversions rewarded the pastor's efforts. One night with twenty-five or thirty responding to the call and moving down the aisle to the altar, George Hall we will call him, the man who had so unceremoniously been put out of church, arose and started to the front, but one of those women whose face may be angelic but "whose tongue is set on fire of Hell," remarked in his hearing, "It's a great meeting, for the devil's coming to the altar." The young man turned and went out; "and it was dark." That silly remark kept a penitent man an outsider for many years; it prevented a pastor from winning a promising man who had already learned a wholesome lesson.

But a lovely sequel ensued. Twenty-three years after, that pastor, after years as Presiding Elder and pastor of leading churches of his denomination on both seacoasts, returned to Fairmount to lecture in this very church. Old friends clustered, reminiscences were exchanged. On the very front seat a familiar face appeared; it was George Hall, once put out, now a pillar in the church. The two men embraced and kissed. Twin sisters couldn't have done it better. Big hearts don't need to carry old grudges.

Washington, D. C.

Christ's life was a glorious unity, firm, well directed, consistent, unwavering, through all His days.

The Primary business for which missionaries went out to the field, and for which we gave of our resources to support them, was evangelical. Soon or late, as we knew, these peoples, however backward, might be able to run their own schools and man their own hospitals. One thing—and one thing only we had, uniquely, to give them. That one thing was the transforming gospel of Jesus Christ.

—*Dr. Stanley Hugh.*

Quantity and Quality in Church Production

Reverend Harold John Ockenga, B.A.

THE fallacy of the English utilitarians, perceived and rectified by John Stuart Mill, in regards to quantity and quality in pleasure, needs to be perceived and rectified in the modern Church in regards to quantity and quality in our work. The utilitarians said that there was no qualitative difference in pleasure and that it was better to be a satisfied pig than a dissatisfied Socrates. Of course other circumstances limited this.

The modern Church thinks that it is better to have great movements and programs and names than to have seemingly insignificant people transformed in their personal lives. The fallacy here is the failure to understand the fact that the whole is made up of the parts, and the whole is no better than its parts. If we are to influence the whole we must influence the individuals that make it up. We must not simply get more good people into the church, we must make more people good. And this can only be done by a qualitative change.

As we survey hastily the world work of the Church and its drives for members, its bleeding the populace for beautiful buildings, its energy in social service, its large talk about home missions, and its broadcasting of foreign work, we realize that quantity is present. And whenever this quantity is impinged upon by a failure to raise a budget or by a large number withdrawing membership the Church becomes terribly alarmed as in the last few years. However, this is nothing to be alarmed over. The startling and alarming fact took place some time ago, when the quality of the Church work was put aside for mere quantity. Individuals might be interested for a short time through a drive in belonging to some church, but when the obligations and sacrifices necessary for such membership are brought to their attention they wither in the rising sun.

We may better the social conditions and the environment of some people for a short time by means of attempting to improve the conditions, but if we fail to remove the causes the same conditions will soon be resultant. A hog placed in a sheep-cote will soon have it looking like a sty. It sounds nice to say that we ought to cease rescuing men from the gutter and that we ought to remove the gutter from the men. But man created the gutter, and if we take it away, he will provide another.

It is nice to have large adorned Gothic buildings, but if they are empty, what will they avail us? It may be worthwhile to educate a heathen, but after all he is really a heathen when finished and perhaps a much more dangerous one. Unless quantity can be combined with quality in individual and church work our production when viewed in the light of eternity is worthless.

Such combined service has been rendered by the historic First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh. Since it was first built upon the land grant made it from the Penns, Godly and capable men have served its congregations. If this were all it would not warrant the present treatment. But there is more, and that more ought to give us a clue to the type of church work needed in this generation.

A great quantity of work is done. Over 5,000 people are touched every week by its meetings. With an organization membership of about 7,500 there is in attendance two-thirds of this number at the various meetings during the week. The membership of the church proper is only about 3,000, but the work extends to a much larger group than this who are either members of other churches or of no churches at all. Over a thousand attend every public Sunday preaching service, between 350 and 450 meet at the midweek prayer service, over 800 girls weekly attend the club meetings, on Wednesday afternoon 600 mothers meet in worship, study, and fellowship in Christian things, 150 men and boys spend some time every Tuesday in church, the Sabbath school varies in attendance from 1,000 to 1,100, a group of more than 100 young people present and discuss Christian problems in their service on Sunday evening, and 22 full time workers are employed in the church every day, besides some who are on the foreign and home mission fields.

These numbers sound great, but if they were just numbers their value would end at that point. But these people come together regularly to hear the Gospel, to receive help in their daily home and life problems, to be comforted and eased of life's burdens, and

to learn how that they may live as their Saviour would have them to live in their daily life. There is no club meeting for the study of cooking, millinery, radio, dramatics, aviation, or otherwise that does not first have its extended period of devotion and Christian teaching. With these things as personal interest attractions the Word of God and the Christ of God are lifted up that people might know Him in His saving power.

Quite often the order of events is happily interrupted by a profession of Christ. It may come in club work, it may come in mothers' meetings, or it may come after the public church service, but come it does. Now a young man stands up and accepts Christ as His hope. He has been a gambler, but he will gamble no more. Soon he brings with him four or five of his former companions and they too feel the touch that shall change their lives. Now a young woman with a shady reputation and a past life turns from her habits to a Saviour Who is able to set her free. Soon she takes up her residence in a Christian home and finds a brighter and more joyous outlook on life. Now a boy asks the leader after his club devotional hour if he cannot be catechized so as to join the church and to let people know that he too is a Christian. Old and young, morally good and bad, they come one by one to Christ.

Then, too, it is wonderful to know that the Master deals not alone with the rich or with the poor, but from the hillsides He draws the laboring and the leisured, the professional and the craftsman, the proletariat and the bourgeoise. Here in the city, in the heart of the business district, they come because of the Light Who is the Light of the world. And here, because quality is produced along with quantity, the church is serving at her best. Perhaps we have here a solution for the great problems staring the modern church in the face. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

God, but What Kind?

Observation at least, in the absence of reflection, ought to teach easy-going opponents of the faith that they are skimming over the surface of the whole problem of religion in their hastily written discussions. Note the signs of the times. In what an amazing way, painstaking research in every field is buttressing the great truths of Christianity! Take the science of physics. After a long, long journey of many decades around the Robin Hood's barn of materialism, physical scientists are slowly approaching the spiritual interpretation of the universe. A single quotation from that modern authority, Arthur S. Eddington, shows the trend. He says:

> We have seen that the cyclic scheme of physics presupposes a background outside the scope of its investigations. In this background we must find, first, our own personality, and then perhaps a greater personality. The idea of a universal Mind or Logos would be, I think, a fairly plausible inference from the present state of scientific theory; at least it is in harmony with it. But, if so, all our inquiry justifies us in asserting is a purely colorless pantheism. Science cannot tell whether the world spirit is good or evil, and its halting argument for the existence of God might equally well be turned into an argument for the existence of a Devil.

Science, it is true, has not yet reached the Christian conception of God, but mark that expression—"the world spirit." It is refreshing to hear that leading scientists are no longer talking of "matter, motion, and force," but of a "world spirit."—*Zion's Herald.*

The Model Church

Well, wife, I've found the model church,
And worshipp'd there today;
It made me think of good old times,
Before my hair was gray;
The meeting house was finer built,
Than they were years ago,
But then I found when I went in,
It was not built for show.

The sexton did not set me down
Away back by the door;
He knew that I was old and deaf,
And saw that I was poor;
He must have been a Christian man,
He led me boldly thro'
The long aisle of that crowded church,
To find a pleasant pew.

I wish you'd heard the singing, wife,
It had the old time ring;
The preacher said with trumpet voice,
"Let all the people sing!"
"Old Coronation" was the tune,
The music upward roll'd,
Till I tho't I heard the angel choir
Strike all the harps of gold.

My deafness seemed to melt away,
My spirit caught the fire;
I joined my feeble trembling voice
With that melodious choir;
And sang, as in my youthful days,
"Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem
And crown Him Lord of all."

I tell you, wife, it did me good
To sing that hymn once more;
I felt like some wrecked mariner
Who gets a glimpse of shore,
I almost want to lay aside
This weather-beaten form,
And anchor in the blessed port,
Forever from the storm.

'Twas not a flowery sermon, wife,
But simple gospel truth;
It fitted humble men like me;
It suited hopeful youth;
To win immortal souls to Christ,
The earnest preacher tried;
He talked not of himself, or creed,
But Jesus crucified.

—John Yates

Christian Evidences

Bishop H. M. DuBose, D.D.,LL.D.

The Psychology of Religious Experience

FEW subjects in the realm of religious thought have been more frequently, or more variously, treated than that of Christian experience, by which is meant the motivation of spiritual consciousness and the illumination and development of personal faith on the lines of Scripture revelation and doctrine. Strangely enough, also, attempts to outline a psychology of experience seem to multiply in proportion to the decline, or arrest, of spiritual power and discernment in the body of believers. During the past twelve months there have appeared probably no fewer than a score of, more or less, widely heralded volumes on the various phases of experience. I have made a reader's contact with a fair proportion of these; but, so far as I have been able to judge, only one of them has effectively touched the subject, or indicated any certain path by which it may be approached. Perhaps this should not be matter of great wonder, since the gate is strait and the way is narrow leading thereto.

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss the psychology of religious experience from four distinct view points, as follows:

1. Religious experience considered as the use and fruit of faith, which is the apprehension and appropriation of spiritual fact and truth as revealed in the evangel, new and old.
2. Faith, or knowledge of spiritual fact and truth, as coming through processes that involve the whole mentality and soul movement of the individual life.
3. The mental processes and emotional movements involved in religious experience as being normal, but intensified by the testimony of the divine Spirit.
4. Concerning both the mind and the emotional nature, as indicating that human life was preeminently designed to answer to the divine life and to receive the higher forms of divine truth.

Perhaps yet another viewpoint might be instituted—namely—the identification of religious experience in the stages of its actual development, which is the test of genuineness and vitality, and which, moreover, is the point which almost uniformly has been missed in the discussions to which reference was made above. But, in filling up the outline already presented, we shall have ample occasion to consider experience from the practical and personal viewpoint.

First, then, religious experience is the use and fruit of faith. It is an attainment not contrary to the natural, healthy experience of the thinking, feeling life; nor is it a thing added to that experience; but rather it is that natural experience chastened, sanctified, and progressively lifted and expanded into the higher spiritual sympathies and fellowships. The new man is the old man renewed; with transformed affections, truth-illuminated mind, and Spirit-quickened will. The identity of the sinner is not lost in regeneration; rather his true identity is recovered. "When he came to himself;" "Clothed and in his right mind," are pictures from the evangel which throw light on the psychology of religious experience at the stage of its beginning.

Here, again, we have a divine psychology which contradicts the modern heresy that the necessity of conversion may be superseded by religious education, begun in childhood and pushed to a goal. The conjunction of two natures is necessary to the new birth, the birth which is from above—namely, the human nature of the believer and the divine nature incarnate in Jesus Christ. The records of civilization, throughout all the past, conclusively show that no kind of culture, considered in itself, has ever lifted the mind or the affections above their natural level. That an invading spiritual influence should do this is contrary neither to history nor to the laws that rule in the higher intellections. Mental science is at no variance with the theology of Christian experience. Theology rightly based, and mental science correctly stated, are seen to have come of the same divine provision. They are the thinking of God's thoughts after Him.

But it is important to consider at some further length the psychology of faith as the apprehension and appropriation of spiritual fact and truth. Faith is thus seen as the channel through which religious experience delivers itself upon the mind and soul of the believer, drawing out and spiritualizing his thought and clarifying and mastering

his emotions and affections. Faith is attested as a series of concepts and spiritual activities which are both logical in themselves and accordant with the mind and soul. Perception, memory, and the affections, are not more native to human life than is faith. Indeed, these are elemental in faith, however rudimentary faith may be. St. Paul, in characterizing the sin and depravity of the heathen world which he knew, declared that the men who typed it were "without natural affection." They had rejected the testimony of their own inner selves. They had violated and made negative those emotions and impulses which the apostle elsewhere declared might have made them "a law unto themselves;" a faith of motive.

The new birth is a Spirit birth through faith, just as the Bethlehem birth was of the Spirit through the choice of the Son. The Bethlehem birth was also into a natural body, with all the affections and susceptibilities of "the first man Adam," who was the generic man. The immeasurable difference which came to the mind and affections of "the last Adam," as compared with the first, was due to the fact that "the last Adam" was made "a quickening Spirit." In like manner as the choice of the Son opened the way for the Spirit to beget the Bethlehem Christ, faith becomes the open door, the logical access, by which the Spirit enters into the life of the disciple, to quicken his powers into new activities, to the ends of true holiness. "By grace are ye saved through faith." Grace is God's contribution to human salvation; faith is the contribution of men. It is a divine reciprocity, with superabundant grace and absolute knowledge holding the upper terminals of human understanding. The sublimest raptures which come in the experiences of men redeemed neither violate nor contravene any law of their natural being.

In the second place, we are to consider that faith comes through processes that involve the whole mentality and soul of the individual believer. This totality has no limit; it involves the life of eternity. In this the Godhead fulfills itself. It is worthy of consideration that religious fact and truth are the only conceivable concern that logically can command the united powers of mind and soul. Men often consider themselves so distrained upon by challengers of the natural self; but the conclusion is fanciful or illogical. Only the divine challenge can reach, at once, "the whole spirit, and soul and body." This is the psychology of faith.

It must appear plain to all who read with attention the New Testament narrative that many of the early converts to the gospel were received of the Master, and had their sins forgiven, when they showed no more than the faith of little children; but it was such faith as described a point of assent and commitment which logically was set to grow, like the mustard seed, to a miracle of enlargement in the kingdom of God, yet always in respect of the nature and consciousness of the sinner forgiven. The identities of the eternal world are the identities of the world that now is. The mustard seed was the figure used of the Master to describe the determinative point in the will and the affections of those who decided for the kingdom of God. Beyond this mustard seed determinative even the grace of God cannot work. "I would...but ye would not." The law under which the worlds were made is the law under which every soul of man is redeemed. This is made plain in the introduction to the apostolic Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the Christ office of creation is linked with the Christ office of redemption: "Whom he hath made heir of all things; through whom also he made the worlds."

Our third viewpoint is that the processes involved in religious experience, though normal, are intensified by the testing of the divine Spirit. The outlines indicated for this discussion are so closely and logically related that it has been difficult to use the vantage of one without anticipating the bearings of the others; but the fact has its compensations. It testifies to the unity of experience, as also to the comprehensiveness of its contents; nor should it be overlooked that herein is an argument for the psychological likeness of all the aspects of that experience which is derived from the teachings of the written Word.

Theology and psychology unite to affirm the absolute office of the Spirit in originating and promoting religious experience. The God instinct, as it is sometimes called, and the worship impulse, are often referred to as innate. In a former paper, I have set forth a contrary view; and that on a purely metaphysical basis. It rather seems to me that the universal presence of the God sense, and the emergence of a worship impulse with the individuals of all races, are due to the constitution of the human mind. In

its feeblest form, and in its most benighted state, the human mind must think on that which is God, or else "likest unto God." This resembles instinct; but surpasses it; it is more. To think at all; to celebrate in the least appreciable way, is to meet the divine. So, since the concept of God is coextensive with thought, it only can be that fulness of spiritual joy comes logically and conclusively of the presence of the indwelling Spirit.

Our fourth point—namely, that the constitution of the mind and the emotional nature indicates that human life was designed preeminently to answer to the divine life—is fairly a restatement of the psychology of religious experience. The proof of this stands in what has been deduced from the argument in its several stages. The Galilean manhood was the answer of Godhood to itself. In that Manhood all humanity, with its mental powers and spiritual yearnings, is federated. That question and answer found in the old Scotch Catechism: "What is the chief end of man? To glorify God, and then to enjoy Him forever," is itself a correct summary of the contents and vitalities of Christian experience. It is a worthy antecedent of the outburst of St. Augustine in his "Confessions:" "O Lord, Thou hast made us for Thyself; and our souls are restless until they find their rest in Thee." But these words, which form the temporal extremes of the school of theology they represent, are not only a summary of Christian experience; but they suggest the logic of the human answer to Jehovah, walking as in the shade of the trees of the primeval Eden. Thought, in whatsoever form it exists, and to whatsoever degree of intelligence, is overt in recognition of God, if only in the vagueness and decadence of fetishism. So, as the mind rises in the freedom and illumination of grace, it discovers its likeness to Him in whose image it was made. Perhaps St. Paul's best definition of Christian experience, from its psychological, as also its theological, side is found in the Philippian injunction: "Let this mind be in you which also was in Christ Jesus."

Current Scientific Discoveries

PROFESSOR GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, A.M.

Scientific Method and Ultimate Reality

TO a baby the objective world is just "one big, blooming, buzzing confusion," as William James has expressed it. Concerning this objective world the baby learns a few things at a time, gradually piecing together his knowledge gained by experience, until he learns that certain lines of conduct always seem to produce certain definite results.

In a more formal and systematic manner, science sets itself to investigate certain limited fields of the total world of reality; and it has succeeded in its work of examining and classifying the universe largely because it has thus limited its inquiries and its field of observations. For science works by the piecemeal method. It selects definite but limited portions of the objective world, and by concentrating attention upon these isolated portions it tries to understand what we term the laws of nature prevailing within these limited fields. Physics, chemistry, botany, astronomy are specialized studies restricted to only portions of the universe; and the success of men of science seems to have been at least largely due to this specialization and concentration upon limited but definite problems from portions of the universe.

Each branch of science thus abstracts from the total of the reality which we call the universe, and in thus abstracting it must always neglect or ignore much more than the narrow and restricted field which it attempts to study. And in this process of selecting or abstracting, each science always has to make certain assumptions, or take certain general principles for granted, which may ultimately turn out to have been very wrong or misleading. Ultimately, perhaps after a generation or more of very "successful" work along their specialized lines, men

of science in the various fields begin to realize that their results are in radical disagreement either with the results obtained in some other related fields, or in palpable disagreement with the results from completely unrelated lines of inquiry. Such a disagreement is always a signal that there is something wrong; and so the investigators have to retrace their steps and see where they went astray.

It is in this way that science makes secure progress, by each generation checking up and criticizing the unconscious assumptions made by its predecessors, as A. N. Whitehead has so well expressed the matter. Just at present, the new physics has found that it must repudiate the old materialistic notion that matter, or the stuff of the universe, is composed of minute hard spheres, like little billiard balls, all ceaselessly engaged in knocking each other about. But biology, which had always copied from physics and chemistry, and which had uncritically assumed this materialistic notion of the stuff composing the universe, is now rubbing its astonished eyes and trying to get its bearings in the new scientific world, As for biology, it is so far behind the times both in its method and its spirit, that it has not yet awakened to the fact that the world is moving at all. Says Whitehead again:

> When you are criticizing the philosophy of an epoch, do not chiefly direct your attention to those intellectual positions which its exponents feel it necessary explicitly to defend. There will be some fundamental assumptions which adherents of all the variant systems within the epoch unconsciously presuppose. Such assumptions appear so obvious that people do not know what they are assuming because no other way of putting things has ever occurred to them. (*Science and the Modern World*, p. 71).

The history of the rise of the evolution theory is replete with examples of such unconscious assumptions which are really the tender spots in the widely popular creed that man has developed from the lower animals. It is these unconscious assumptions which we as Christians do well to consider critically, if we wish to clear up the widespread confusion now prevailing in the relations between science and religion. Accordingly, we may be able to clear up the present muddled situation by going back to these fundamental assumptions which were held all unconsciously by the scientists of the middle nineteenth century. And just as soon as we adopt a critical attitude toward these basic assumptions of Darwin and Lyell, we gain a completely new view of the world, a view however which brings us back into complete harmony with the first chapters of Genesis. And this naturally suggests that we are on the right track.

Just at present the new physics finds itself with an irreconcilable disagreement between its wave theory of light and the modified form of the corpuscular theory which certain phenomena have compelled it to adopt. This situation has driven our modern physicists and astronomers to search anew the foundations of their science, with the result that the old materialism has been repudiated, and such men as Jeans and Eddington and Arthur Compton are saying that science must not be expected to tell us anything at all as to the real nature of matter, science can only tell us how certain forms of matter tend to act or behave.

The old idea of the iron "laws" of nature, always assumed to be universal throughout the universe, has broken down entirely. Indeed, says Whitehead, this assumption of the materialistic view of nature "was pure bluff," on the part of the scientists of the nineteenth century, "if one may credit them with believing their own statements." It mattered not that these views of nature were utterly contrary with revealed religion. But now that vital scientific facts have developed which render this view quite impossible, this nineteenth century "bluff" is being called, and modern physics has become humble and reverent, with views about the ultimate behavior of nature which are quite in harmony with the Christian doctrine of God's word as the universal cause back of all phenomena.

Three aspects of natural science are now evident. First, there is the patient gathering of facts, with their classification for ease in handling them. Secondly, there are the theories by which new facts are "explained" by being brought into relationship with facts and principles already known or assumed. Thirdly, there is the critical phase under which discrepancies and disagreements are given a chance to be heard, and a more perfect harmony is sought between all the facts known to modern discovery. Only as these three aspects develop *pari passu* can modern natural science, or any particular branch of it, be said to be in a healthy condition.

For science can never attain finality. It must always be changing, always progressing, always leaving its low vaulted past and

building more stately mansions for its mental home of tomorrow. But this means that what it has attained today is only probable; its tomorrow will be something different. Its yesterday is already outgrown, tomorrow will smile at the crude ideas of today. And happy will the world be if in this steady movement of natural science we may attain to a fuller and more nearly truthful picture of nature's ineluctable dependence upon Him in Whom we live, and move, and have our being.

The one thing which does not change is God's written Revelation. The God of Heaven saw that man could never attain to finality in his search after truth from nature alone. So He graciously gave mankind a written Revelation to keep them from making a mess of their interpretation of the larger book of nature. The history of civilization shows that such a written Revelation is necessary. And as in these modern times we see that the scientific discoveries are bringing us back step by step nearer and nearer to that written record of God's creation and His constant care for His created works, we have reason to be thankful that this written Revelation has been telling the same consistent story all these centuries.

Blessed is that man who has not allowed himself to become stampeded by the noisy claims of materialistic science. For just as the recent archaeology of Egypt and Babylonia has found that it must adopt the shorter form of its chronology and thus come into fuller agreement with the Bible record, so does a more critical and a more truly scientific view of geology. Similarly the modern discoveries in physics have forever banished that old materialistic view that Jehovah had delegated His powers to the atoms and the molecules, these agents of the great Absentee being all the gods which we mortals need have any concern about. Instead of a remote Prime Mover of the universe, as taught by Aristotle and by twenty centuries of neo-pagans, Jeans and Eddington and the others of the modern school of physicists are at last speaking of the Prime Mathematician. And if at present they do not picture the King of the Universe in all the living colors of the New Testament, their outline is at least not a burlesque or a caricature, and the Christian believer can easily fill in those details of His character which we must not expect natural science to be able to discover.

Yet the humble trusting believer will not become unduly elated because modern science in its varied aspects is now confirming many of those teachings of the Bible which for so long have been termed "unscientific" and "incredible." He remembers the case of Thomas, who insisted on having objective proofs of the resurrection of the Master. Jesus gave these scientific evidences according to the request, then added: "Thomas, because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

The planet Mars has two satellites or moons. The inner one named Phobos circles around Mars three times while the planet is rotating once. This makes nonsense of the old nebular hypothesis. The same may be said of the eighth and ninth satellites of Jupiter which are retrograde in their movement, that is, they revolve in a direction the reverse of the other movements of the parts of the solar system. The satellites of Uranus also are a queer lot.

But all these minor objections to the old theories sink into the background as compared with what astronomers regard as the two major objections to the nebular hypothesis of Kant and Laplace. These two major objections are: First, that the contraction of the mass composing the solar system must have resulted in a constant speeding up of rotation; so that the sun, the central residue of it all, should be whirling at a terrific speed. But it isn't; it rotates very leisurely, or once in about 25 days. The second and what Jeans calls the "more deadly" objection is that, if a rotating mass goes to pieces because of its speed, it should break up into two approximately equal parts,—which is utterly at variance with what our rotating solar-system is supposed to have done.

No, the nebular hypothesis was propounded in an age of ignorance; it lasted only as long as this ignorance of the facts lasted. It has long since been out of date. And every similar guess as to how the solar system was created must, like the Laplacian theory, become utterly discredited whenever we get at the real facts.

Evangelical Christianity used to bring the individual soul into the audience chamber of the Eternal, and leave him there alone, face to face with his God. Modernism brings the modern man before a picture of his animal ancestors and whispers in his ear, "See what you have developed from; aren't you clever?"

The Church in Europe

FREDERICK HASSKARL, M.A.,B.D.

"Gleanings"

IN January's number of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE, in this department, was an article entitled "A Christocentric Life." One statement was challenged. It is this: "A vast host went its quiet way—the German pulpit was overwhelmingly sound in the essentials." It is a fact. So many of us Americans, unacquainted with the language of Luther, are under the impression, that evangelical Germany is permeated with Liberalism. Why is this?

First, the World War engendered a great amount of prejudice against German theology, the Liberals saying it was hopelessly fettered by the autocratic traditionalism of state controlled fundamentalism. On the other hand, a large throng of fundamentalists traced all forms of Modernism in theology to the German universities.

Second, many of the liberally-minded professors of theology in America had studied, not in conservative German schools, but seemed to have sought out the more radical teachers.

Third, anything "new" tickles man's innate curiosity. Publishers know this; therefore German books advocating "new trends" found quick translation and a profitable market. This "modernistic" tendency is older than Paulinism, for we read, "All the Athenians and strangers spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or hear some new thing." (Acts 17:21.)

However, the men who had been raised in homes where there was a correct appreciation of German evangelical theology due to the fact that the language was understood as well as English, could readily go to the rich sources of scholarly theological books. Sad to say, hundreds of these have never been translated. Of the many volumes of modern sermons by eminent German preachers in my study, I find but two with modernistic tendencies. It is my purpose to translate some excerpts in the near future for this department. The fact remains that the German pulpit is overwhelmingly sound in the essentials.

Next to the sermon, come the weekly or monthly church papers for the laity. I have just received a packet of such from a German colleague covering almost every part of the Vaterland. Here and there among the conservative articles, which fill the magazines, I have selected but a few thoughts. Please note the wide range of their authorship as well as the eminence of the writers.

"Christian Mercy"

BLESSED are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy." Christian mercy has two sides; it has mercy with the brother in need and does not conduct itself niggardly, but it gives; and it has mercy with the fallen brother and does not sit in judgment over him, but it saves. Christian mercy indeed breaks bread with a brother, but not only the temporal, but also the eternal Bread of Life. Christian mercy is more, much more than mere benevolence, altruism, social service. Christian mercy has compassion on the soul of our neighbor; but it seeks also to save the soul of the sunken and fallen one. In short, Christian mercy to human *souls*, is the very *soul* of Christian mercy.—*Dr. Oscar Pank.*

"Holy Scriptures"

WE should not measure Holy Writ with our reason, judge It, try to understand It or explain It thereby, but we should consider it prayerfully with all diligence and thus strive to understand It. The Holy Spirit is Here the sole Master and Teacher. When I become perplexed, I reach for my Bible and soon find a text or a verse, that holds Jesus Christ before me: how He died for me, and I am at once comforted.—*Luther.*

"The Bible"

THE Bible is my noblest possession. Without It I would be miserable indeed. All the books which I have read, have not given me the comfort, which the single verse of the 23rd Psalm has given me: "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I shall fear no evil, for Thou art with me."—*Kant.*

"A Parable"

IMAGINE a family that once possessed a beautiful, secure home; through neglect, storm and earthquake the house suffered in its foundations and roof. Some members of the family begin to rebuild. It costs them much sweat and labor in heat and cold. However, this makes no difference to them, for their desire is to put the dear old homestead into order. One member of the family stands idly by and looks on. In the background of his thoughts are these words, "If all this work is in vain, I at least have not plagued myself with it!" Who does not say at this: "that fellow is 'calculating,' and is hardly worthy to find warmth and protection within its walls."—The house on which one is now building anew is the Church of the Lord. Those are not lacking who desire to interfere with its structure. He who stands idly by is also interfering. "He who is not with me, is against me," the Lord says; "He who gathereth not with me, scattereth." Therefore, do not stand "wisely" (klueglich) in the background. Take a positive stand. Be an active confessor. Build! If you are affronted as a builder of Christ, bear the affront. Of all things continue to build in your heart and home,—for it is the one great need of this poor, erring generation.—*Dr. Ahlfeld.*

"Purposeful Living"

WHEN it is a matter of the dearest and highest we possess, no man compromises. We have this choice: either to live for oneself, *i. e.*, to enjoy ourselves, to please ourselves: Then our life passes away, as the grain of wheat decays in the cellar—a blessing to none, without fruit for time and eternity; or to put purpose into our life. We want to become something within and without. We want to have been constructive to at least one human being before we die. If that is the case, there is but one way—that of Good Friday. Then we must have the courage to sacrifice ourselves for humanity, for our calling, for our country, for the Kingdom of God. There is no third, no compromise, no "in-between."—*Dr. Dibelius.*

"The Perfect Son"

I AM sorry that the title given to this incomparable parable is "The Prodigal Son"; I am very sorry that so often the feeling is awakened, that the son who remained home is named by implication and apology "The Good Son." To my mind all this misses the point. These two sons, who remain at a distance from their Father, are not the only sons of God. In the parable of Jesus there appears a third son besides the one, who ran away from the Father and the one who stands without the Father's festive hall. This third son is He, Who spoke the parable,—He who so thought and so acted as the Father in the parable thought and acted. To Him the Father said, "All that I have is thine," and He took the Father's Word without that rapacious pride, which arrogates to itself, that which is God's. Furthermore, He believed God when He said, "Thou art ever with me," even then when He went His way burdened with the cross. To this third Son of God, we are leading our youths. We commit their souls into His keeping. By doing so we know that they are not going the way of the son who deserts, nor are they going the way of him, whose filial service is painful, but they are going the way of Him, Who received the gifts of the Father thankfully and labors in His service joyfully. Thus they are saved from two great dangers: from the hunger of the one who lost all that is essential to life as well as from the legalistic servitude of him, who feels himself bound and in fetters. The parable of Jesus reveals to our young people the perfect Way, when we grown-ups are ever mindful of the genuinely joyful and perfect obedience of the Son of God.—*Prof. A. Schlatter.*

SALVATION and service should be the goal in the hearts and homes of humanity everywhere. For this we are here. That men are privileged to be here for this purpose, that we pastors are privileged to be here for this purpose,—should it not resound in our soul as hymns of praise and as the morning song of birds, whenever we meditate hereon!—*Dr. Fr. Rittelmeyer.*

Hannah's Dedicatory Prayer

"This child we dedicate to thee,
O God of grace and purity!
Shield it from sin and threatening wrong,
And let thy love its life prolong.

"O may thy Spirit gently draw
Its willing soul to keep thy law;
May virtue, piety, and truth,
Dawn even with its dawning youth!"

From the German. Tr. by Samuel Gilman
In Methodist Hymnal, No. 232.

THE PULPIT

James M. Gray, D.D.
I. M. Hargett, D.D.
Elmer Ellsworth Helms, D.D.
Floyd Tomkins, D.D., LL.D.
Milton Harold Nichols, D.D.
Walter D. Buchanan, D.D., LL.D.
Clarence Edward Macartney, D.D.
Rev. Carlton R. VanHook
Thomas S. Brock, S.T.D.

Relation of the Spirit of God to the Word of God

James M. Gray, D.D., LL.D., President Moody Bible Institute

Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you.—1 Peter 1:10-12.

I

PETER had been speaking of the salvation to which believers on Christ have been begotten by the mercy of God (vv.3-9), and he now says that of this salvation the prophets had "inquired and searched diligently." The "prophets" were the writers of the Old Testament, and the matter they "inquired and searched diligently" about was "the manner of time" when the sufferings of Christ should occur and his subsequent glory.

Although they had thus prophesied or "testified beforehand" of these things, the apostle says that after all it was not they who did it, but "the Spirit of Christ" (*i. e.*, the Spirit of God) who was "in them." In other words, he says that the Spirit of God is the Author of the Word of God. But this is not the only place in which Peter announces this truth. He repeats it in his second epistle, saying: "No prophecy ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:21, R.V.).

And Peter is corroborated by Paul when in 2 Timothy 3:16, he says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," or as literally rendered, "All Scripture is God-breathed."

Finally, the Old Testament writers themselves, when alluding to their messages, do so in language admitting of no doubt as to their inspiration. Two-thousand times when describing the source of their revelation, they employ the formula, or its equivalent: "Thus saith the Lord." David testifies: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue."

What Inspiration Means

Of course, it is not assumed to say just how the Spirit of God did these things, any more than one would undertake to define how He regenerates sinners. We do not know the method He employed to speak by men of old time, but we know that He did it on the testimony of the Scriptures themselves which, on other and sufficient grounds, we accept as credible in their statements of fact.

Nor should it be supposed, that in speaking of the inspiration of the Scriptures we are referring to the translations, but only to the original autographs, the records as they came from Moses, David, Isaiah, John or Paul, as the case may be.

And this is not an academic question merely. No one should suppose, in other words, that it makes no difference whether the autographs were inspired or not because we only possess translations of them. For as a matter of fact, these translations, the Revised Version of the English Bible, for example, are to all intents and purposes transcripts of those originals. The science of Biblical Criticism assures us of this. It does, indeed, raise a question here and there as to the accuracy of a given text; yet the result of all these questions put together does not affect a single essential fact or doctrine in the whole Bible.

II

But the Spirit of God is not only the Author, He is also the Revealer of the Word of God. The text proceeds:

> Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently. . . .
>
> Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are reported unto you.

It is an interesting and informing picture we have here. These men were first moved by the Holy Spirit to write concerning the sufferings and glory of Christ, and then applied themselves to understand what they had written. Failing to accomplish this in their own ability, the Holy Spirit, who had moved them to write, revealed to them the meaning of what they had written. It is

He who tells them, that "the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow" belonged not to their time but to ours.

And this is perfectly accordant with Christ's promises in John 14:26; 16:13,14.

The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance. . . .

It is equally accordant with Paul's words to the Corinthians:

Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit.

He does not say God hath revealed them unto us by His Word, though they are in His Word; but by His Spirit through His Word. The revelation of the Spirit, in other words, is necessary to understand the revelation of the Word.

It is then impossible to know the things of God in His Word except as we have the aid of the Holy Spirit to do it. Nor does this mean only that the natural man cannot know them, which goes without saying, but that the spiritual man, the regenerate man, cannot know them without that aid.

A Common Experience

And is not this a matter of common Christian experience? Does not every earnest Christian know of passages in the Bible that are his in an intellectual sense, which he can expound, but which he does not really possess in the sphere of his spiritual being? And has he not had the experience again and again, of the Holy Spirit's taking these things and showing them unto him so that they have become his by a kind of miracle?

The Spirit of God is not only the Author and Revealer, but also the Preacher of the Word of God. Listen to the text again, 1 Peter 1:12.

A supernatural gospel throughout! Written, revealed and preached by the Holy Ghost. Its origination, explanation and proclamation alike divine. Peter preached it, the other apostles preached it, the disciples preached it; and yet it was the Holy Ghost who preached it, or it was not preached.

And is not this what Jesus promised?

Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you and ye shall be witnesses unto Me (Acts 1:8).

Is it not the effect of Pentecost?

They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance (Acts 2:4).

And so the miracle continued. Twenty years later, Paul writes to the Corinthians:

I was with you in weakness, and in fear and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and in power.

Modern Examples

And has the miracle ceased? Is preaching "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven" no longer known to men? Did the phenomenon end with the apostolic era? Ask the preachers of the Reformation period. Ask Wesley or Whitefield. Ask the French Quaker, Stephen Grellet. Read the life of Spurgeon, or of Charles G. Finney or Dwight L. Moody. Familiarize yourself with the annals of nineteenth century missions. So full are they of illustrations of this same supernaturalism that A. T. Pierson aptly called them, "The New Acts of the Apostles."

When ministers feel the special gracious influence of the Holy Spirit in their hearts, it wonderfully assists them to come at the conscience of men, and, as it were, to handle them; whereas, without these, whatever reason or oratory we may employ, we do but make use of stumps instead of hands.

This is what our own great American missionary, David Brainerd, said, and here we have the key to Brainerd's wonderful success, when God seemed to bow the heavens and come down upon the hearts of the Indian savages to whom he preached in Stockbridge. And the explanation of it is seen in the closet where Brainerd is praying whole days for the anointing of the Holy Spirit and praying with such intensity that his garments are wet with the sweat of his intercession.

When we have this power, we find that whereas before it was hard for us to do the easiest things, it is now easy to do the hardest things. James Hervey, the friend of Wesley at Oxford, describes the change which took place in Wesley through his anointing by the Holy Spirit, by saying that while his preaching once was like the firing of an arrow—all the speed and force depending on the strength of his arm in bending the bow, now it was like the fire of a rifle ball—the force depending upon the powder, needing only a finger touch to let it off.

May the Holy Spirit come upon us preachers, missionaries and Sunday-school teachers and teach us this secret of the irresistible might of weakness, of doing great things for God through the power by which God does great things for us.

For Your Scrap Book

Reverend A. Wallace Copper, A.B.

Hindenburg and Germany *

IN the German *Who's Who* of 1914, as every German general is mentioned as a matter of course we find the name of Hindenburg. It is not there because he has been personally prominent. His biography is very brief. It merely notes his gradual and regular advancements. He was conferred a minimum number of medals consistent with his rank. His entire public career has been concentrated in the fifteen years since the outbreak of the war.

Hindenburg was sixty-seven years old before Germany at large heard of his existence. In childhood he worshipped God, the Fatherland, the king, and Frederick the Great. As an old man in his eighties he is inwardly loyal to the same. He has an almost fanatical will to serve, to be a follower rather than a leader. His attitude is fundamentally feudal. His almost fanatical desire to serve demanded a Kaiser but now the Fatherland has taken his place.

Young Hindenburg was slow to learn. Never did he quickly grasp an idea. Unlike other children he was never inquisitive, possessing little imagination and never wondered about anything. He never asked, "Why?" He accepted everything he was told and never asked questions. Having one aim, namely, to become an efficient officer, he received no classical education.

His religious training was not confined to Bible stories for his Mother taught him that a religious attitude ought to deeply permeate every subject. As an old man he writes, "My parents gave me the best thing that parents can give their children; a faith in God the omnipotent, an unbounded love for the Fatherland."

Later he declared that life did not begin for him until he put on the uniform of the king and became a cadet. As a boy of eleven he left home to go to a military school. So decisive was the break that he made a will. In it his toys and the roll he received each morning for breakfast was given to his brother Otto.

At the cadet school at Wahlstatt he suffered less from cruelties because he was a born subordinate. As an old man he said, "Since my days as a cadet I have never read a book that did not deal with military affairs."

When the war started with Austria in 1866 he wrote to his Mother, "It is high time that a Hindenburg should smell gunpowder again, for a soldier war is a natural state of affairs, and besides I am in God's hands." When he learned his father was to be in the war as a Red Cross officer he wrote again to his Mother. "What a marvelous relationship it is; the wound which the son must inflict may be healed by the father, and yet both are doing their duty."

For forty years he was engaged with military peace work. From 1871 to 1911 when he retired from the Army he drilled regiments, taught military tactics, advanced slowly step by step from a captain to a major, from a major to a lieutenant-colonel, and finally to a lieutenant-general. His promotions were all granted because he had reached the age when not to be promoted would be an insult. He was never promoted because of any outstanding service. Even Nieman, his most enthusiastic biographer, admits he was an insignificant part of the Empire's new army which was organized and developed during the Wilhelmean era.

Hindenburg had been retired three years when at three o'clock August 22, 1914 the Kaiser sent him a telegram asking him if he was ready for immediate service. He wired back two words, "am ready."

The real legend of Hindenburg developed because of the victory of Tannensberg and many of his other decisive victories on eastern front. Somehow the people of Germany could not realize that the strategic battles would be on the western and not the eastern front. Hindenburg was a great stabilizing factor. When Ludendorf went into a panic the stolid calm of the aged general brought him back. The one weapon of Hindenburg was the threat to resign. Gradually he work-

* *The Man and the Legend*—Goldsmith and Voight.

ed his way to the most prominent position of his country during the great conflict.

The stokers at Kiel in 1918, who drew the fires on the battleships averted another winter of war and by doing so earned the gratitude not only of their country but Europe. Germany lost the war when Hindenburg and Ludendorf completely lost their heads. They frantically sent telegrams to the Kaiser stating that the army could hold out no longer. The politicians in Berlin wanted to continue the war. The militarists wanted it to cease. Suddenly they discovered that they had underestimated the capacity of the German troops. Then they wanted to fight, but the politicians wanted peace. The people of Germany remained loyal as long as they were convinced it was a war of self-defense. But when it became known that the policy of the Kaiser was annexation they rose up in revolt.

After the Republic had been established under Ebert, the great problem was what to do with the Kaiser. Hindenburg assumed full responsibility to get him over the Dutch border. He then offered his services to President Ebert. The legend was again reborn the moment he did this. Over seventy and thinking of finishing his days in peace he entered the second retirement, and again he achieved unsought eminence. Elected president of Germany at the age of eighty he still has that almost fanatical desire to serve—now not the Kaiser but the Fatherland. The German people do not need the Kaiser. Hindenburg, his beloved friend, is ruling in his place.

Recent Discoveries†

IT was not until 1628 that anybody knew the heart pumped blood through the arteries and received it back through the veins. The heart was thought to be the source of the innate heat of the body. The lungs were considered bellows which cooled the overheated body. Some of these ideas lasted until the seventeenth century.

It has not been quite four hundred years since Vesalins published his magnificent book on the structure of the human body. Today for the first time we have an accurate account of the organs of the body.

Modern anatomy and physiology did not have its beginning until the end of the fifteenth century and strangely the first real student was not an anatomist but an artist, Leonardo da Vinci, painter, sculptor, architect and engineer.

† *Yourself Incorporated*, by Adolph Elwyn.

Fritz Kreisler

FRITZ KREISLER was in the city of Hamburg waiting for a steamer to London. He was giving a concert on the following evening. Stopping in a music store he looked at the violins. The manager observing his instrument slipped out and brought in detectives and declared that the visitor had stolen the violin of Fritz Kreisler. No one would believe his claim to be the great violinist. Finally, he asked the manager to play the victrola record "The Old Refrain" and then "Ave Maria." He did, and Kreisler played it and all were satisfied.

Ghandi

SAMUEL ZIMAND, journalist, tells the story of how he stepped from the train in a certain Indian town and started to the hotel with a porter. The poor fellow was one of the unfortunate creatures called "untouchable." Zimand asked him his name and he did not know it. He asked him his age and he did not know it. He asked him where he was born and he was unable to answer. When Zimand mentioned the name of Ghandi, as if by magic the man fell to his knees crying, "Ghandi, the son of God."

In newspapers, advertising space runs from 40 to 50 per cent. The New York *Times* consistently maintains the latter figure. Thus, of 2,600,000 tons of newsprint pulp consumed annually, well over 1,500,000 tons goes into advertising. A single New York newspaper will annually account for upwards of 2,000 acres of forest land in wood pulp consumed. It is estimated that 80 per cent. of all mail matter consists of advertising material. The Wrigley Gum electric sign at Times Square, New York, consumes $108,000 worth of current each year. At the top of the Cleveland Discount Company appears this legend:—"This sign burns more current than the entire town of Elyria." Elyria has a population of 30,000 people.

Kangaroo hides travel from Australia to Lynn, Massachusetts, and are made up into shoes which only Australians will wear and then shipped back the 12,000 miles to Melbourne.

Young People's Department

Reverend Harold John Ockenga, B.A.

Topic for May 31
Calvin or Predestination

Carl McIntire, A.B.

Introduction

ARE the mysterious events of life the result of "Fate," "Chance," "Luck," or "Predestination?" The inquisitive youth as well as the thoughtful philosopher is interested. Youth have a perfect right to such questions, and may go where saints fear to tread, but such a going may be commended only when a thorough investigation of the question involved is made. Speculation as to the above question leads only to a possible "Chance." For the Christian, however, the question leads back to the eternal purpose of God, and in the nature of the case cannot be solved unless God gives us the answer. So we turn to His word with a willingness to abide by what we find.

Calvin's formulation of the doctrine

John Calvin (1509-64) was a leader in the reformation movement which led to the foundation of our Protestant churches. From the Scripture Calvin formulated the doctrine of absolute predestination in which he taught that *all* things which come to of lots, the number of hairs in our head, is predepass are foreordained by God. This includes all of man's acts both free and sinful. Not merely the "mysterious events" of our above question, but every event; e.g. the falling of a sparrow, the casting termined by God who for His own Glory hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass. Calvin's statement of the doctrine of predestination has been generally accepted by Reformed Theologians as presenting the Biblical teaching.

Scriptural foundation of the doctrine

The Scriptural basis for the doctrine may be seen in the answer to natural questions which arise.

1. Are all things foreordained? Not only will specific Scripture passages say, "yes," but the answer to our other questions will support the "all things." Romans 11:36 reads, "For of Him and through Him and to Him are all things"; Isaiah 26:9-10 says, "I am God—declaring the end from the beginning and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, my counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure." See also Daniel 4:35; Psalm 135:6.

2. Are the free acts of men foreordained? As the convex and concave are but different sides of the same curve, so a free act of man and the predestination of that act by God are but different sides of the one act. The prophecies of the Bible are sufficient to show that free acts can be and are foreordained. Events which were to be fulfilled by the acts of men were predicted as certain years before they came to pass.

3. Are the sinful acts of man foreordained? Scripture clearly represents sinful acts to be foreordained. Acts 2:23, in speaking of Christ's death, the greatest sin of men, says, "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Jesus himself says, "Truly the Son of Man goeth as it was determined; but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed" (Luke 22:22). This passage presents the general teaching of scripture that even though our sinful acts are foreordained of God we are personally responsible for committing the act. See Rev.17:17; Gen.45;7,8. Sin has entered the world through the will of man and man is responsible; yet, all this has been foreordained of God. This resolves itself into the more fundamental question, How could a Holy God foreordain and permit sin to enter the world? The answer to this question God has not revealed to us in His word. He has told us that all things (Rev.4:11) are for His glory, and in some way He is overruling (Gen.45;6,7) sin for His own Glory. Our reason is finite. We know that sin is and that God is, and for some reason known to Himself God can and has decreed that sin should occur.

4. Are men foreordained to be saved? Scripture says, "Yes". Rom.8:29 reads, "For whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son." Eph.1:4 says, "He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." See also Eph.3:11; 2 Tim.1:9; 1 Pet.1:20,21; Rom.11:33-36. If God had chosen some to be saved from eternity then he has left some unchosen from eternity. The mystery of it all God knows. He has not revealed all things unto us. Our sinful finite minds probably could not understand it all if He did.

Conclusion and Practical Value

According to the Bible there is no such thing as "Fate," "Chance," or "Luck," but everything which comes to pass is foreordained by an infinitely wise and Holy God who is working all things out to a definite end and for His own Glory. Think of the infinite greatness of our God! He has seen fit to reveal to us this fact—*predestination*—that it might be of supreme comfort and value to us in our living. For in this teaching of Scripture we know that our salvation is secure from God's eternal purpose, that God alone deserves Glory and Honor for salvation is from Him, that the sin and failure of our past life He is overruling for His Glory, and that as Children of God redeemed by the blood of His Son we go forth with all confidence in Faith to serve and worship Him.

Questions

1. How do we know that things are predestinated?

2. Why has God told us of the fact of predestination?

3. Give the Scripture passages which show that God predestines us to be saved.
4. Does predestination relieve us of our responsibility in the sin of our own acts?
5. Is it right to speak of "Luck" or "Fate?"
6. How may I make this doctrine of God's Word apply to my own life?

Books for Reference

1. *History of the Reformation.*
2. *The Institutes* (for deeper study), by John Calvin.
3. *The Writings of Jonathan Edwards.*
4. *History of the Christian Church,* Vol. VI, by Philip Schaff.

God's Sovereign Will

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm;
Deep in unfathomable mines
Of never ending skill
He treasures up His bright designs
And works His sovereign will.
(*See Hymn 519 in Presbyterian Hymnal*)

Topic for June 7

Wesley, or the Spiritual Life as the Basis of Reform

EARL E. ALLEN, A.B.

Scripture: Romans 5: 1-11; 12: 1,2; James 2: 14-26; Acts 17: 1-6

IS the gospel of Christ the power of God unto the salvation of the individual person alone? or of society? or of both? We hear much emphasis today upon the social gospel. As young people we are challenged to face the ills of our current social life, not passively to submit to these ills that they may perpetuate the blight which they produce, but to build a sound basis of reform which will transform our society.

Are not we today in danger of trying to put the words "Lord, Lord" into the mouth of society and of leaving its heart far away from God whom to experience is to experience transformation? Can we hope to take a short-cut route to social reform by too easily thinking to save all by seeking to save the surface?

Jesus sounded one of the keynotes of the religion which He taught and lived when He prayed in Gethsemane: "Father, not my will, but thy will be done." Christianity at its best does not alone demand social adjustments and reforms with the voice of a trained social worker; it most of all furnishes the inner spiritual power for that transformation. It seeks to know the will of God and then sets about to do His will by the most approved methods.

A young preacher confessed the shrivelled nature of his message. He was in earnest and dissatisfied when he said, "The most that I can do when I get out into the full-time ministry is to give these selfish industrialists 'hell.'" What should his message be? Should it not be patiently to preach and to minister to souls, diseased and warped by selfishness, until they enter the true church and grow in the redemptive truth of God, and thus transform their lives and their business?

It is the place of religion to go to the soul of our social ills to transform the stream of life at its source. Every true Christian is a reformer and is never content while the society in which he lives is unchristian. Today organized Christianity wanes because it stresses the forms of social transformation but denies its power.

Into the bankrupt society of the eighteenth century was born John Wesley, through whom above all others of his century flowed the power of God unto the salvation of that society. It is to Wesley that we look for the illustration of our thesis that the spiritual life is the most potent basis of reform.

I. Transformed for Transformation

1. The light breaks through

John Wesley, with his Oxford University training, was a failure as a minister of Christ in Georgia. Technical training he possessed, but he lacked the God-given spiritual power to use that training effectively. Wesley's age was an age of reason, but an unreasonable reason, reason that was divorced from real experience. Up to the time of his missionary journey to Georgia, Wesley had worked his reason, but his undirected reason was not the basis for a reasonable faith in the God of Christ who not only forgives but fills with power. Up to this time Wesley's life had plan but it lacked motive power with far reaching purpose. Had not Wesley and his associates been called "Methodists" at Oxford because of their methodical habits? Those habits awaited the power of God experienced in life to produce a living church.

Then Wesley met Peter Böhler and his Moravian brothers. They despaired of the coldness of intellect separated from the warmth of heart devotion. They coupled heat with light and convinced Wesley of the reality of a vital, moving experience of God as seen through Jesus Christ.

2. Heat for power

Of this new birth of spiritual power within his soul, while some one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans, Wesley writes that it happened "about a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death."*

Healthy life gives rise to activity and Wesley's new spiritual life charged him with a zeal and a conviction which demanded expression.

3. A "single eye"

From the time when he received his pentecostal gift of power, Wesley felt the irresistible urge to constant ministry. The conviction of the truth that God forgives and blesses those who have faith in His mercy and grace as Heavenly Father gave Wesley the basis of experience upon which he established his whole life with marvelous singleness of purpose. Woodrow Wilson writes of him: "John Wesley . . . planned no reform, premeditated no revivification of society; his was simply the work of an efficient conviction." Of the value of such conviction Wilson continues, "Neither men nor society can be saved by opinions; nothing has power to prevail but the conviction which commands, not the mind merely, but the will and the whole spirit as well. It is this, and this only, that makes one

* Telford, John, *The Life of John Wesley,* p. 101.

spirit the master of others, and no man need fear to use his conviction in any age."†

II. The Power of God Unto the Salvation of Society

1. Bewildered society

Wesley's age was a bewildered age. In the field of religion men were trying to reconcile the truth of revelation with what they thought to be the truth of the sciences of that day. While the theologians "reconciled" they failed to emphasize the abiding and vital truths of Christianity. The spirit of the age was coldly intellectual and far away from some of the vital truths which meet men's deepest needs.

With a sleeping church went festering immorality and a host of ills springing up from the newly born industrialism in England. The people of the British Isles (as well as those on the Continent) in the early eighteenth century were sheep without a shepherd in many of the same ways in which many of the bewildered people of the world today are shepherdless. Wesley sought his sheep and found them upon the heaths and hills, in the hamlets and cities of England and the world. Bewildered and harassed people in all the world today are looking for shepherds. Therein is the challenge for tremendous ministries in the Spirit of Christ.

2. Life made vocal

Wesley's speech was not his only nor his most effective voice which he raised in prophetic helpfulness to a needy world. The great preacher, George Whitefield, far surpassed Wesley as an orator, but Wesley's life, in all of its exhaustless expressiveness, spoke more effectively than Whitefield's winsome words. Wesley made his entire life vocal with the truth of Christianity. He not only made his own life vocal but he also made the lives of his followers vocal. He taught them how to express this newly experienced Christ Spirit in life. They gave to the poor who needed help. They fought against evils of personal indulgence and negligence.

Wilberforce caught this spirit through Wesley and he made his life vocal in fighting the frightful evils of human slavery. The last letter which Wesley wrote before he died was to Wilberforce, encouraging him in his work. The followers of Wesley put through the first labor laws and started the first labor unions in England. There is hardly a major movement for human betterment in this entire period which did not owe its very life to Wesley.

3. Life begets life

Try as they will, scientists cannot produce life without the assistance of living organisms. It takes life to beget life. It requires spiritual life to transform society at its heart. It is the strong living organism which can throw off ills and grow strong. Because man is a spiritual organism—a living soul—as well as a physical organism, he possesses the capacity for spiritual growth. He possesses the power of transformation in so far as he gives himself in faith to express the higher life of God in thought, word, and deed. Because society is made up of men it can become basically transformed only as these men give themselves over in this way to the power of God unto salvation. Wesley points the way.

† Wilson, Woodrow, *John Wesley's Place in History*, pp. 45, 46.

For Discussion

1. Do you think that we have any reason to believe that Wesley prevented a revolution in England?
2. Can the criticism that Wesley had little interest in social reforms be verified?
3. What significance for us today has the fact that some of the greatest British missionary societies sprang up as a direct result of Wesley's ministry?
4. What must be at the very center of any successful reform movement?
5. Do you think that the organized Christian church today should actively and even militantly engage in social reform movements? Is there any danger in such a program?

For Research

Rattenbury, J. Ernest, *Wesley's Legacy to the World*, Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1928.

Telford, John, *The Life of John Wesley*, Hunt & Eaton, New York.

Thompson, D. D., *John Wesley As a Social Reformer*, Eaton & Mains, New York, 1898.

Welch, Herbert, *Selections From the Writings of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A.*, The Methodist Book Concern, New York and Cincinnati.

Wilson, Woodrow, *John Wesley's Place in History*, The Abingdon Press, New York and Cincinnati.

Winchester, C. T., *The Life of John Wesley*, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1927.

Lead On O King Eternal

Lead on, O King eternal
Till sin's fierce war shall cease,
And holiness shall whisper
The sweet Amen of peace;
For not with swords loud clashing,
Nor roll of stirring drums;
With deeds of love and mercy
The heavenly kingdom comes.

(*See hymn 408 in Methodist Hymnal*)

Topic for June 14

Jonathan Edwards, or American Religious Thought

H. J. Ockenga, M.A.

JONATHAN EDWARDS was the first and the greatest American philosopher and theologian. Of him Dugald Stewart said, "He in logical acuteness and subtlety does not yield to any disputant bred in the universities of Europe." Our estimate of him today is the same. It is doubtful whether America in the hundred and fifty years since his death has produced a theologian and philosopher of equal mental fibre and prodigious works.

I. The Life of Edwards

In East Windsor, Connecticut, October 5, 1703, Jonathan Edwards was born of sturdy New England stock in the same year that John Wesley made his advent into the Epworth rectory of England. Strange that there should be so many parallels between the life of Edwards and the lives of other great men who have influenced the world. Edwards lived to be fifty-five years of age, exactly the same as the great theologian, Calvin, to whose theological

system he devoted the energy of the best years of his life. His father was Timothy Edwards, the pastor of the Congregational church in East Windsor. His mother was the daughter of Solomon Stoddard, another famous Congregational minister.

Edward's childhood was marked by mental precocity. At ten years of age, he wrote a thesis entitled, *The Nature of the Soul.* At twelve he published a treatise on the habits of spiders. At thirteen he entered Yale and four years later graduated as valedictorian of his class. During two years of graduate study, he worked out all the essential elements of the theories which he developed for the next forty years of his life. At seventeen he decided to enter the ministry, a decision which was simultaneous with the acceptance of the truth of predestination and the sovereignity of God. As a flower opens to the morning rays of the sun, so his heart gradually warmed to this logical doctrine. After tutoring at Yale, he became assistant minister to his grandfather at Northampton. In a few years he was the sole minister of this important congregation.

He married the beautiful and pious Sarah Pierrepont who was his intellectual equal and made him a suitable and devoted wife. Eleven children were born in the manse and George Whitfield was so attracted by the domestic felicity of Edward's home that he resolved that "upon many accounts, it is my duty to marry." Everybody who ever enjoyed the hospitality of Mrs. Edwards was similarly impressed.

For twenty-three years Edwards labored as pastor of the Northampton church. His ministry was marked by a passion for souls, by preaching against looseness of morals, and by stress on evangelism that ended in the Great Awakening. In two years all of the available adults in the town were converted and remained so.

At the close of this powerful and influential ministry, circumstances combined to dethrone Edwards. He left Northampton, penniless, destitute, broken in health, responsible for a large family, but with an ever firm faith in God to care for him. He was soon located as a missionary to the Mohawk Indians where he divided his time between theological study and missionary endeavor. From there he was called to the presidency of Princeton University. After a few months as persident of the University, smallpox raged through Princeton and Edwards sickened from inoculation. As the last bleak wind of winter was sweeping across the central Jersey plains and marshes, Edwards sent his love to his wife, telling her he expected to be forever joined with her in the Great Beyond. And then, with the same implicit faith in the sovereign God Whom he had served from his seventeenth year onward, he passed away.

II. The Faith of Edwards

Edward's faith is commonly known as Calvinism. This he derived from John Calvin, a Frenchman born at Noyon in Picardy and deceased in Geneva, Switzerland. Calvin's doctrine is set forth in his *Institutes of Religion.* Its essence consists of five main propositions. These propositions set forth the evangelical principles which are common to the reformed faith.

1. God is Sovereign, immutable, infinite, and Perfect in all His attributes. According to His sovereign pleasure, He elects men to their course in life.

2. The Atonement made by God incarnate in man is a limited, conditional Atonement. That is, that Jesus Christ shall save His people, those elected, from their sins. This alone can answer the question, Why are not all men saved if Jesus Christ died for all men?

3. The human personality is spiritually depraved and utterly unable in the religious realm to do good. Good is possible ceremonially, civilly, and morally, but not spiritually. To be spiritually good is possible only through the Spirit of God.

4. Grace, that is, the influence brought to bear by God upon the human personality, is irresistible. This deals only with the realm of salvation. Common grace which is received by all men is resistible and special grace is resistible after the regeneration experience.

5. Final perseverance of the saints, that is, that all those who have been objects of irresistible grace shall persevere to the end, is the most valuable and practical doctrine of Calvinism.

III. The Influence of Edwards

This doctrine was preached by Edwards for twenty-three years in Northampton and throughout the New England States. Two important contemporaries of Edwards, George Whitfield and Gilbert Tennant, also emphasized these doctrines. It resulted in the revival known as the "Great Awakening" which swept New England in '41 and '42. Whitfield in his diary records the following incident:

"Sunday, November 2. Was much dejected a half hour before the sermon. Before I left Mr. Noble's house, I could only lie before the Lord and say, 'I was a miserable sinner' and wonder that Christ could be gracious to such a wretch. As I went to the meeting I grew weaker and when I came into the pulpit, I could have chosen to be silent rather than speak; but after I had begun, the whole congregation was alarmed. Crying, weeping, and wailing were to be heard in every corner. . . . After I came home, I threw myself upon the bed, and in an awful silence admired the infinite greatness, sovereignty and condescension of the love of God; divine consolations flowed in so fast that my frail tabernacle was scarce able to sustain them."

Here we see that the motivating force in these great revivalists was an intense belief in the sovereignty of God and in His unmerited grace. Under the preaching of such dignities it was no wonder that Calvinism had a revival in New England.

The influence of Calvinism has been felt in the movement known as Puritanism. Puritanism is the Genevan doctrine in theology and the Genevan aristocracy in the State. The name Puritan is really an epithet of opprobrium. It is like the term "Christian" and "Quaker" and "Methodist." Puritanism had ceased in England by the time it began in America, but the United States Puritanism has exerted an even greater influence on the Anglo-Saxon world than the British Puritanism. It has resulted in industrial progress, solidity of character, and a sturdy racial group, all of which have been manifested both in England and in America where Puritanism was influential. As an ecclesiastical system, Puritanism has passed away, but its inner dynamic is still exerting its influence in the commonwealth where Calvinism gained its formidable foothold.

Conclusion

When we think of Emerson, Longfellow, Whittier, and a host of other eminent Americans who were the direct products of ethical Puritanism, we cannot help but reverence such a system of thought and life. Today there is much declamation against Calvinism with a deplorable lack of the historic values of the system. But a true appreciation of the doctrines and the dynamics of such a personality of Jonathan Edwards will inspire afresh our generation to a real appreciation of the Scripture and historic Christianity.

Book References

1. *The Life of Edwards,* by H. B. Parks.
2. *The Works of Edwards; Religious Affections; Freedom of the Will; Original Sin.*
3. *American Thought,* by Riley.
4. *The Institutes,* by John Calvin.

Be Strong

Be strong!
We are not here to play, to dream, to drift;
We have hard work to do, and loads to lift;
Shun not the struggle—face it; 'tis God's gift.

Be strong!
Say not, "The days are evil. Who's to blame?"
And fold the hands and acquiesce—oh shame!
Stand up, speak out, and bravely, in God's name.

Be strong!
It matters not how deep intrenched the wrong,
How hard the battle goes, the day how long;
Faint not—fight on! Tomorrow comes the song.

—*Maltbie Davenport Babcock*

Topic for June 21

D. L. Moody—The Evangelist

Wm. T. Blackstone, A.B.

"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15) was the last and great commission of our Lord to His church. Those disciples who heard Him went forth to evangelize the world after that the Holy Spirit had come upon them. Certain ones were chosen leaders in the new church, some were set aside for one thing, some for another, but all,—Apostles, and laymen,—all became evangelists. Paul, though an apostle, was an evangelist in that he carried the Gospel of Christ to sinful dying men (Acts 26:16-23). Peter was an evangelist as he carried the Gospel to the Jews around him. Philip, an evangelist, brought the Gospel to the wicked city of Samaria and great joy followed in his wake (Acts 8:4-8). The whole church centered its effort in evangelism and a mighty widespread movement resulted which has swept over the whole world.

Dwight Lyman Moody is perhaps the outstanding recent example of an evangelist. During the span of his life—from 1837 to 1899—he "addressed more hearers, prayed and pleaded with more individuals, and established more permanent centers of religious activity than any other preacher of modern times." The ruling passion of his life was the winning of souls and this more than anything else, characterizes him as an evangelist.

1. The Man

Born and raised in a humble country home in East Northfield, Mass., he was anything but promising in his youth. But when he left home to seek his fortune in Boston, though his pursuit of knowledge in the village school had not proved very successful, he had learned from his experience of hunger, cold, and hardship what it was to be generous, cheerful, self-reliant and brave.

He had a physical strength which helped him mightily in his many and continued campaigns. He had inherited also a strong will, a purposeful disposition, and a masterful character which made him a natural organizer and leader of men. He had an unfailing sense of humor, an active and independent mind, and a shrewd business ability. These all stood him in good stead but far above all these he was genuinely "born again" (John 3).

One night in a store in Boston he met Jesus Christ and because he had himself experienced salvation he was able to introduce others to Him. It was in his own Mission Sabbath School, however, that his eyes were first opened to the great "luxury" of saving souls. One of his teachers was deeply concerned over the souls of his class of frivolous girls. The teacher knew he had not long to live and together they visited one after another definitely asking them to accept Christ. Before ten days had passed every one in the class had yielded herself to Christ. The prayer meeting that night of separation marked the crisis in young Moody's life. As a result he gave up business and became the evangelist that we know.

2. His Life

It is not, however, enough that an evangelist should have a message and a calling, there must be power—the power of the Holy Ghost. The fruitfulness of any man's ministry is dependent upon his abandonment to the Will of God. While in England he heard Henry Varley say: "The world has yet to see what God will do with a man who is fully and wholly consecrated to Him." Moody determined to try his utmost to be that man and the practice of complete yieldedness to the will of God became the secret of his life and power.

Neither were his prayers nor his seasons of private communion of any great length but he prayed at all times and in all places and for all matters of any concern to him whatever. His life from morning to night was lived in accordance with God's Will. He believed God's Word implicitly, he trusted God for all things, and he never found Him to fail. It was this that gave fruit to his ministry and power to his life. His one great and ruling passion was to win souls to Christ. Three years before his death to the International Sunday School Convention in Boston he said: "If I had the trumpet of God and could speak to every Sunday school teacher in America, I would plead with each one to lead at least one soul to Christ this year!"

3. His Message

Above all an evangelist should be judged by his message (Read Gal.1:6-9). The burden of Mr. Moody's preaching rang true to the Word of God. From that time when Henry Moorehouse first influenced him he became an eager and faithful student of God's Word and urged upon every one else its study as well. His sermons were based upon it and filled with it. He gave a positive and convincing affirmation of the love of God and His redeeming grace in Christ Jesus. And this message he delivered so vividly and so forcefully that the throngs who heard him were convinced and convicted and many in response to his appeals decided for Christ.

All over England, Scotland, Ireland, and his own beloved United States there were countless lives transformed through the message he brought. In a word he preached, as did Paul before him, "Jesus Chirst and Him crucified." It was this message delivered in positive certainty, empowered by the Holy Spirit, and urged with a passionate and earnest appeal which drew and held the mulititudes wherever he went. Jesus said: "My word shall not return unto Me void" and because he preached God's revelation to men his influence and his work will abide forever.

Conclusion

When Jesus told us to "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" he was sending every member of his body—the church. We cannot leave this all important work to the ministers of our churches nor to the Foreign Missionaries nor any one else but every one that is "born again" must join in the great task of winning souls to Christ. Moody found his message in the Word of God and his dynamic in yieldedness to the Will of God and so must we if we would be true to our Lord's command. The consuming passion of Moodys' life came to be the quest for souls and this, if anything, is the message of his life for us today. In season and out of season, no matter what may be our lot in life, let us make it the motivating purpose of our lives to introduce men to Christ, our Redeemer and our Lord.

Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature!—Mark 16:15.

SUGGESTED READING:

D. L. Moody—His Message for Today, by Charles R. Erdman, D.D., LL.D.

Every-Member Evangelism, by J. E. Conant, D.D.

ANALYSIS:

1. Is the Great Commission for every Christian or only for the foreign missionary?

2. Is it the natural and acquired ability of a man or his yieldedness to the Will of God which brings the greatest results?

3. Is the message which Moody preached and Paul before him the most needed today?

4. What is the greatest challenge from Moody's life for us today?

5. Are you a soul-winner? If not, why not?

Moody, or Evangelism

(Contributed by Francis Thomas)

One by one each soul is entered
In the Book of Life;
One by one each heart Christ-centered,
Freed from sin's death-strife.

Just one arrow sharply pointed,
Pierced the wand'rer's heart;
Just one Christian, God-anointed,
Bravely did his part.

One by one the moments cherish,
Fleeting one by one;
One by one they pass and perish,
Duties left undone.

One by one behold each sinner
Going to his doom;
Speed to tell them, Oh, soul-winner,
At the Cross there's room.

Seek the one soul, lost, backslidden—
Come, ye ninety-nine!
Find each one some soul sin-hidden—
Jesus says, "'Tis Mine!"

Topics for Young People's Department for 1931

We have been requested to print the Topics for this department for the balance of year 1931, *and we print them below.*

June—Judges of Modern Israel

May 31st—Calvin, or, Predestination.
7th—Wesley, or, Spiritual Life the Basis of Reform.
14th—Edwards, or, American Religious Thought.
21st—Moody, or, Evangelism.

July—A Christian Summer

5th—Luther, or, Justification by Faith.
12th—What is the Christian Idea of a Vacation?
19th—What is the Christian Idea of Happiness?
26th—What is the Christian Idea of Amusement?
2nd—What is the Christian Idea of the Body?

August—Conference Month

9th—Camp Meetings—Holiness Doctrine.
16th—Keswick Conferences — Victorious Life Teaching.
23rd—Young Peoples' Institutes—Life Service.
30th—Sunday School Conventions—Better Teachers.
6th—Y. M. C. A. Camps—Four-fold Life.

September—Preparing for the Winter

13th—Higher Education—Those Who leave us.
20th—Home Opportunities—Those who Stay.
27th—Our Society Purpose—Without a vision the people perish.
4th—Membership Drive — Bringing others to Christ and to our Society.

October—Prayer Month

11th—The Question, or, The Analyses of Prayer.
18th—The Obedience, or, The Authority in Prayer.
25th—The Science, or, The Art of Prayer.
1st—The Practice, or, The Act of Praying.

November—Missions

8th—The Command—God's Expectations.
15th—The Challenge—Our Failures.
22nd—The World Need.
29th—The Home Need.
6th—The Christian Attitude and Opportunity in Missions.

December

13th—To Obey is Better than to Sacrifice—Obedience.
20th—A Christian Christmas.
27th—Should We learn from Experience of others?
3rd—Have Our Past Experiences Prepared us for the future?

Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, A.M.,D.D.

A Treatment of Fundamentalism

THE book to which attention will be called in this article is entitled *The History of Fundamentalism.* It is written by Professor Stewart G. Cole, Ph.D. (University of Chicago), and is published by Richard R. Smith, Inc., 12 East 41st Street, New York. The author is a member of the faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa., which belongs to the Northern Baptist Convention, a school that was founded by Mr. and Mrs. John P. Crozier and their family for the purpose of training young men for the gospel ministry.

According to the author's acknowledgments in his introduction, the following well-known persons were his mentors and advisers in the production of his book, "without whose aid this contribution to an understanding of contemporary Christianity would have been impossible" (so says the author): the late Gerald Birney Smith, who first suggested to the author the subject of his investigations; Dean Shailer Mathews, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago; Dr. William B. Pugh, legal adviser to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; Professor W. E. Garrison, of the Disciple Divinity House; Professor A. W. Nagler, of Garrett Biblical Institute. These men, says the author, "gave me the benefit of their criticisms of chapters five, six, seven, and eight, respectively." On the front page of the jacket appears a strong endorsement of the book by Dr. Halford E. Luccock, who says that it is marked by "a complete absence of polemic spirit." In commending Professor Cole's performance, Dr. Garrison declares that Fundamentalism is "a type of religion indigenous to the frontier" and "a survival of colonial Christianity."

We shall give a brief summary of the contents of the book. Chapter I bears the title, *The Social Pattern of Inherited Christianity,* in which the author delineates the "colonial foundations of religion," early educational conceptions, the desire to establish a Christian civilization, "the basic appeal of Biblicism," and the early "ideals of church and society." The second chapter treats of *The Impact of Secularism on Christianity.* Here the author tries to make out that progress in industrialism, science, and education, was opposed by the so-called "Biblicists." Chapter three deals with the rise of *Liberal Christianity* and the conservative reactions to its propagandism. In chapter five there is a narrative of the rise of what is technically known as Fundamentalism, especially the publication by Lyman and Milton Stewart of the series of tracts known as *The Fundamentals.* Chapter five depicts the status of orthodoxy in the Northern Baptist convention, while chapter six recites the story of "Neo-Calvinism in the Presbyterian Church." Then follows in chapter seven a presentation of the "restoration movement" in the Disciples denomination. Chapter eight gives a disparaging picture of *The Essentialist* and its relation to the Methodist Church. Other chapters lead out with the following headings: *Traditionalism in the Protestant Episcopal Church; The Post-War Revival of Orthodoxy; The Professional Training of Orthodox Leadership; The Accommodation of Science to Classical Orthodoxy* (here the Scopes trial is lightly treated); *Two Experiments in Sectarianism* (the Baptist Bible Union and the conference of American undenominational churches); *An American Federation of Orthodox Forces* (dealing with the World's Christian Fundamentals Association); closing with a chapter on the *Conflict Within Current Christianity.*

Such is an outline of the contents of Dr. Cole's volume. It is greatly to be regretted that the Herculean task of writing the history of American Fundamentalism was not undertaken by some one who is in sympathy with the evangelical cause and who understands its spirit and appreciates the motives that have inspired its exponents. Instead of

a fair and thoroughgoing presentation, the church is now treated to a one-sided and *ex parte* "history" (so-called), written by a militant and hostile Modernist. While he nowhere explicitly states his own views, it is plain that all his sympathies are with the modernistic party. Yet he is a teacher in a school that was founded to train young men to preach the Word of God!

As has been said, all the men whose counsel he sought in the production of the book are out-and-out Modernists, some of them even radically so. We omitted at the proper place to mention effusive commendation of the book by Henry Nelson Wieman, another writer whose liberalism is well known. Evidently Professor Cole made no effort to secure the help and advice from a single evangelical believer. His counselors all belong to one side.

But how vulnerable are some of these laudatory remarks: When Dr. Luccock says that there is "a complete absence of polemic spirit" in the book, one cannot help wondering what his idea of polemics is. In reality the work fairly bristles with polemics, and ungenerous polemics at that. Professor Garrison's remark that Fundamentalism belongs to "the frontier" and is "a survival of colonial Christianity" displays about as much knowledge of true Fundamentalism as a ten-year-old boy would have of Einstein's theory of relativity.

In this review we shall use the term "Fundamentalism" in the inclusive sense in which it is used in this book. The author puts all Fundamentalists into the same group.

Apparently he does not see the historical importance of noting a very definite difference between Fundamentalists. Perhaps he is not even aware of it. The World's Christian Fundamentals Association according to its own formal declaration has added to the confessional basis of the Historic Protestantism an emphasis on Premillennialism of rather an extreme form. Many widely known exponents of the New Testament and Reformation Christianity do not sympathize with this emphasis. Among these is such a man as the late Dr. Robert Dick Wilson. However this distinction has not produced any division in the Evangelical line up and men who do not share the Premillennial view or emphasis are welcomed upon the platform of the Christian Fundamentals Association.

At this point it becomes necessary to point out the polemical and derisive temper revealed in Dr. Cole's book. By the use of satirical and stigmatizing expressions he seeks to give to orthodox people a bad odor. Turn to page 250, where he says that "the Bible school evinces a devout, though derisive, spirit in the classroom." Then: "Their passion for saintliness often leads to near hysteria." They are under a "constant nervous strain, due to an exaggerated belief in the inner working of the Holy Spirit." This and their belief in the second advent of Christ "tend to produce a psychopathic condition in the devotee." "Lectures are inspirational rather than historical and interrogational." "They trade on the good names of Dwight L. Moody, Martin Luther and Paul." "They resort to arbitrary use of the Scriptures to support their dogmatics." Ponder this sentence: "The Bible schoolman's feeling of inferiority in modern scholarship is compensated for in his sense of superiority in spiritual status, and this condition of mind permits him to engage *ex animo* in any diatribe he pleases against open-minded seekers for the truth that makes men free." These are samples of Dr. Cole's unkind and unfair treatment of evangelical Christians. His method is that of the caricaturist.

We shall make no counter-charges against liberalism, but will indicate Dr. Cole's own modernistic position by a few salient quotations: "Liberal writers gave primacy to reliable methods in scholarship and submitted their principles to the test of personal experience or historical evidence;" but the orthodox party appealed to "super-rational standards of revelation and intuition." The "one group availed themselves of the academic tools of progressive education; the other reproduced the medieval authority of supernaturalism." This on page 47. Again: "The ethical value of the cross took precedence over the substitutionary theory of the atonement in evangelistic appeal" (this means in liberal circles)..."The theory of evolution gained in recognition, so that a reasonable gospel was displacing a miraculous one" (p. 50). "The faith of Modernism did not so much change the dogmas of orthodoxy; rather, it invigorated them" (p. 331). "When scholars began to cultivate the historical approach to the Scriptures, courageous churchmen welcomed the findings and advanced a more fitting program for the kingdom of God" (p. 334). "But the progressive forces continued to in-

terrogate the foundations of the historic faith, and they refused to be mastered in the church" (p. 336). On page 21 he says that "the doctrine of the inerrancy of the Scriptures received its fatal blow in the seventies" (meaning as far back as 1870).

On the other hand, note how ungenerously he treats orthodox people: "An appeal was made to autocratic authority in the form of Biblical literalism;" "attempted to suppress liberal thinking;" "to condemn the findings of Biblical scholarship;" "a reactionary enterprise" (said of Hudson Taylor's self-sacrificing missionary efforts); "a divisive Bible Union" (said of the China Bible Union); "ultra-conservative literature;" "war psychology" (attributed to the Fundamentalists); "religious militancy;" "perverted attitude of Fundamentalists toward social Christianity;" "national pretensions" (referring to the convention of the League of Evangelical Students); "social reaction to science;" "experiments in sectarianism;" "this type of interpreter appealed to the principles of magic rather than to those of science and religion;" "dogmatic loyalty" (that is, loyalty to the Holy Scriptures); "assume the role of authoritarian agents of the supernatural;" "their sense of self-importance;" "antiquated Christian doctrines;" "their personal ambitions." Are such epithets an index of a fair and judicial temper?

But the whole basis of Dr. Cole's contention is wrong. It is founded on misapprehension, to use the mildest term the case will permit. He does not discern the spirit and motive of the men and women whom he criticises and derides. He has not entered into their conceptions, but judges them from the outside and from his own subjective prejudices. It cannot be said that he deals with his subject in a detached way. In the whole book you will not find a clear-cut distinction between the views of the Fundamentalists and the Modernists. Much as the author boasts of the superior scholarship of the Modernists, he nowhere lucidly defines their real position. Let us try, then, to do in brief space what Dr. Cole fails to do in a book of 360 octavo pages, including the index and bibliography.

What is Modernism? It is a religious movement that places human reason above the Holy Scriptures, and feels competent to go through them and pick out just what may be accepted and what may be rejected. In its cavalier treatment of the Bible it harks back to the rationalism and negative Biblical criticism that originated years ago in Germany, where it has done untold harm. It holds that there are many "outmoded categories" in the Bible and that these may be discarded at will. They are only the "scaffolding" of Christianity. Therefore, they are no longer needed. Wedded to evolution, as if it had been scientifically established, its advocates twist and wrench Biblical history, by means of their documentary theory, to fit it to that hypothesis.

The supernatural element in the Bible is offensive to the Modernists, because they believe only in a so-called "law-abiding God." Most of them either doubt or deny the Biblical doctrines of the virgin birth of Christ, the resurrection of Christ, the resurrection of the dead at the last day, the substitutionary atonement of Christ, His apocalyptic second coming, and the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Thus one need not be actuated by "passion" or "hysteria" to see that liberalism is a departure—not to say an apostasy—from historic and Biblical Christianity. Therefore it has been the chief cause of strife in the Christian church since the rise of rationalism in Germany and of evolution in England.

Now what are the chief holdings of evangelical Christian believers,—those who broadly speaking are popularly called Fundamentalists? They uphold the doctrine that "all Scripture is God-breathed" (2 Tim. 3:16). From this premise it follows logically that they accept all the doctrines clearly taught in God's Word, the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Among these doctrines the following stand out conspicuously:

1. The ontological Trinity;

2. The true deity and humanity of Jesus Christ;

3. His virgin birth;

4. His substitutional atonement, His suffering in man's place the penalty of man's transgressions, thus revealing the self-sacrificing love of God and at the same time satisfying and upholding the eternal principle of justice;

5. The resurrection and glorification of Christ's body;

6. His ascension to the right hand of the Majesty on High;

7. His glorious second coming at the last day to raise the dead and judge the world; His bringing in the new era when there

shall be "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness;"

8. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son in Pentecostal power to apply redemption, enlighten, regenerate and sanctify the human soul.

Of course, the doctrines of creation and preservation are also a part of the creed of the evangelical school. The supernatural element in the Bible is also accepted by all true Biblical Christians. They stumble not at the Biblical teaching about angels and their holy ministry. They believe also in the existence and malevolence of Satan and his host of evil spirits.

Con this list of Biblical doctrines; then remember that Biblical Christians accept all of them; thus you will see the polar difference between the Fundamentalists and the Modernists. This difference can be stated crisply in a sentence: The Fundamentalists are Biblical; the Modernists are rationalistic. We must insist that Dr. Cole nowhere brings out this clear and outstanding distinction. Rather, he seems to disguise it.

In several respects Dr. Cole's information has not been brought up to date. Of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association he says it "seems to have run its full course" (p. 317). This is an error. Last year's convention in Los Angeles, California, was one of the best, most largely attended and most enthusiastic conventions ever held under its auspices. There was no sign of weakening; no indication that it is becoming a spent force. The present writer was there, and knows whereof he affirms. Dr. Riley's resignation and Rev. Paul R. Rood's election to the presidency in 1929 simply meant that the former was overwhelmed with work. He is secretary of the association and editor of its organ, *The Christian Fundamentalist*, which, we understand, has a large circulation and exercises a commanding influence. (This article is being written before the 1931 convention of the Christian Fundamentals Association takes place in Philadelphia, Pa., for which reason no description of it can be given here.)

Dr. Cole also tries to discredit Harry Rimmer by saying that his Research Science Bureau "presumably" "has ceased to function" (p. 267). We beg to inform Dr. Cole that Harry Rimmer is very much alive. Within the last year a number of very telling scientific pamphlets have been issued by his Bureau, while he has been delivering lectures in many places over the country.

Our critic's treatment of Dr. Sloan and the Methodist League of Faith and Life is also mis-coloring of facts. He seeks by scornful expressions to disparage and belittle them, and even represents them as having failed in their efforts.

We must assure Dr. Cole and his misinformed readers that Dr. Sloan is as active as ever, is in nowise daunted, and has greatly enlarged his sphere of influence by becoming the editor-in-chief of this magazine. If he "felt providentially called" (Dr. Cole's sarcastic language) to criticise the books and articles of Drs. Edwin Lewis and Arthur W. Nagler, it was only because those gentlemen taught doctrines that are un-Biblical and un-Methodist, and that while occupying professorships in Methodist schools. What else could an earnest and conscientious Christian believer do? We are convinced that Dr. Lewis's conception of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ is a recrudescence of the Monarchianism of Paul of Samosata, who lived away back in the third century.

Moreover, last March Dr. Sloan challenged Dr. Lewis to a debate on the latter's conception of the person of Christ as set forth in his book, *Jesus Christ and the Human Quest*. Dr. Sloan proposed to prove that Dr. Lewis's doctrine is unscriptural, contrary to the self-consciousness of Christ, without a basis in either history or philosophy, and seriously obstructs the work of the Holy Spirit. Did Dr. Lewis accept the challenge? He did not; he ignored it. Did he know that he could not defend his teaching? We leave it for others to judge. Of this incident Dr. Cole makes no mention in his book. Why?

But enough. We do not assert with pleasure, but with regret, that, to correct all the mistakes of Dr. Cole's book, and to exonerate conservative believers from all his unjust charges, would require another volume of the same size as his own—360 octavo pages.—*L. S. K.*

The Geological-Ages Hoax*

Reviewed by Byron E. Nelson, Th.M.

AT the outset of this review I wish to take this opportunity to express my gratitude publicly to Professor Price for the great service he did me about ten

** The Geological-Ages Hoax.* By Prof. George McCready Price. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago, price $1.50.

years ago, when his just published *New Geology* first fell into my hands. I was then in a perplexed state of mind regarding the proper interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. At the University of Wisconsin, where I studied, I had had inculcated into me the notion of vast geological ages, in which a progressive development of life had occurred, which could be traced in the rocks. That there was any fallacy in that notion never occurred to me. At least, I myself could see none. I was trying, therefore, to reconcile somehow the record of creation in Genesis with the theory of the long ages of evolutionary development as shown in the rocks. I found it a difficult task.

I bought and read Guyot's *Creation,* in which the author, one time head of the geology department at Princeton, attempted to show how, by calling the days of Genesis "ages," a parallelism could be said to exist between the evolutionary geological theory and the Biblical account of creation. On many scores I was not satisfied with the attempted reconciliation, which is the best that I have seen along that line.

Then Price's *New Geology* came into my hands, and I began to see what I had never even faintly realized, namely, that the modern geological theory of great ages is based on most bald and arrogant assumptions, and that if one denies those assumptions, as he has strong reasons for doing, the whole theory collapses.

I then got hold of Price's *Fundamentals of Geology* and read that. I was now intensely interested. Day had begun to dawn. To make sure that Price was right, I began an intensive study of modern geological literature, and found, to my amazement and pleasure, that what I had once believed were firmly established facts, namely, that there had certainly been immense geological ages, which could be distinguished from one another by the aid of fossils, was a fallacy.

I doubt if there is any other reader of Price's geological writings who got more satisfaction out of the discovery to which his books pointed than I. I had long studied the theory of organic evolution from the biological point of view, and had seen that, biologically, evolution didn't have anything to stand on. The fact, however, that there were said to be in the rocks clear evidences of a development of life from the simple to the complex still made me ill at ease. What I learned from Price put me on the right track, and made me see that, instead of geology strengthening the theory of evolution, it made it absurd.

I learned to know that the argument for evolution from geology is an example of reasoning in a circle of the most simple and obvious sort. This is what modern geologists do. They assume (from what biologists are supposed to be able to tell them) that living things have evolved from the simple to the complex throughout vast ages. Then they find strata with the simplest fossils in them and say that, because those strata contain those simplest fossils, the strata are very old—the first to be laid down. Then they find strata with less simple fossils and say that, because those strata contain those more complex fossils, they are not so old. So the geologists continue and tell us that, because certain strata contain certain very complex forms of life, those strata are very young. In this way they separate the rocks into "older" and "younger" divisions, and give them appropriate names —Cambrian, Carboniferous, Cretaceous, Pliocene, etc. Then, having decided thus which rocks are old and which young, they proceed backward. They ask: Would you like to have a proof that living things have evolved from the simplest to the most complex? Very easy. See, they say, here are the oldest rocks, and see, they say, these oldest rocks have the simplest forms of life. And see, here are some rocks not so old, and see, they say, those rocks have more complex forms of life. Therefore, they say, because the oldest rocks have the simplest forms and the youngest rocks the most complex forms, we see that living things have evolved from the simplest to the most complex through many ages.

This perfect-circle reasoning Price has pointed out in all his geological writings. If there is any doubt in anyone's mind that such is the reasoning underlying so-called modern historical or theoretical geology, he needs just to read geological literature; and, if he has the least portion of gray matter, he can see it as plain as day. I owe Price thanks that I have learned to see it. My wife, who also studied geology at Wisconsin, and to whom the fundamental fallacy underlying the teaching of modern historical geology in the university never occurred, likewise appreciates what Price did for her.

When I published my *After Its Kind,* in discussing the so-called geological argument

for evolution, I made liberal use of the unanswerable objections to that proof which Price's works point out. And so interested did I become in Price's hypothetical explanation of the cause of the earth's stratified condition, namely, the Flood, that I made a thorough study of geological literature from the time of Philo the Jew to the present, and have written a book, which my publishers tell me will be out in July, tracing the Flood theory of geology from the beginning of geological speculation to the present time.

Brilliant men, as brilliant as any men today, especially in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, argued capably and at length for the Biblical Deluge as the great geological agent in producing the earth's fossiliferous condition. That theory was the dominant one for two hundred years, though the theory of uniformity, which now has the upper hand, had a few upholders among the irreligious. The uniformity theory had come down from the ancients, but the Biblical theory had the greatest and most numerous upholders.

Price's *The Geological-Ages Hoax* is his shortest treatise on geology. It can be read in a couple of hours. It is a sort of summary of his previous writings, giving, as it were, the cream of his larger books. It is written in simple, non-technical language. Briefly, but forcefully, he discusses seven propositions or assumptions of the accepted theory and shows how unacceptable they all are if one wishes to be scientific, that is, if one wishes to build on facts alone. Having read carefully all Price's larger works, and carefully verified them by a study of geological literature, I naturally regard his last work of less value to me personally. But for those who do not want to study the larger and heavier works, and want merely to get the gist of Price's strong position, *The Geological-Ages Hoax* is excellent. One can not read it intelligently without seeing that modern theoretical or historical geology has no scientific basis.

Professor Price seems hopeful of showing the leaders in the modern teaching of geology the fallacy of their line of reasoning and causing them to be more logical, and, therefore, more truly scientific. I think that he is knocking his head against a stone wall. The leaders in geology today are believing what they like to believe, not what they find to be true. I have good friends high up in the biological circles of the country who are evolutionists. I know that they know that their facts are perfectly capable of another interpretation beside the evolutionary one, *e. g.*, the similarities between unrelated organisms can be accounted for as well on the basis of a common plan in the mind of the Creator as on any theory of common descent. But they prefer the evolutionary interpretation and teach it, the reason being that they like it better. It suits their religious lives more. So it is with modern geologists generally. They know as well as anyone else that their whole geological system is built on assumptions pure and simple. But those assumptions suit their souls. They enable them to get rid of the supernatural and all that goes with it.

From my study of the history of geological theory I know that the modern theory came into popularity instead of the once predominant Flood theory in an age and under the influence of a rising tide of skepticism and hostile Biblical criticism; and, with such skepticism far worse among men now than it was one hundred years ago, there is not, in my opinion, the ghost of a chance of changing anything in geological circles. The benefit of Price's last work, as well as his earlier ones, is that they help believers in the Bible to think straight, and so see through the smoke-screens of doubt which the world is ever trying to cast over the Word. After all, it is the elect that count.

Perth Amboy, New Jersey

Reviews of Recent Books

The Burden Made Light. By Rev. Alfred Doerffler. Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Street, St. Louis, Mo. 75 cents.

Who ought to get this comforting little book? Everybody. The person who is afflicted in any way—through sickness, disappointment, poverty, bereavement or otherwise—ought to read it. The pastor ought to have it in a conspicuous place in his library, perhaps right before him on his writing desk, in order that he may learn from its pages how to comfort his afflicted parishioners. The parish worker ought to have it at hand, for he will meet with many people who need to be cheered and comforted. Even the unbeliever ought to read it, for in it he will see how the Bible meets all the deep needs of

the human soul. He ought also to be able to see that, if the Bible is not God's true revelation, then men have no source of solace for life's ills. Persons who are harassed with doubt will see in the pages of this book that God has a purpose for good in permitting affliction to come upon people; that He can "bring good out of evil;" that He turns our afflictions into means of discipline and thus furthers us in the Christian life. Here the reader can see that our Lord's purpose is set forth beautifully in His saying: "Every branch in me that bringeth forth fruit, He purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit." The author is a firm believer in the plenary inspiration of the Bible, and that explains why he is able to give so much comfort to people in affliction. God's love is greater than even mother-love. An appropriate prayer closes each section of the book.

Our Serial—The Clamping of the Shackles

A story that deals effectively with some of the crucial questions that are now disrupting the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ

PROFESSOR GLENN GATES COLE, LITT.D.

XXX

Jennie Claims John's Life

"Your life is mine; but I am going to give it to her. And, when she shall descend to the very portals of death for you, John, only to find that you are ungrateful and unappreciative, I hope she will feel as I do now. But I give you to her, so go!"

MRS. AUSTIN stepped out, and called Mary to her. In a whisper she told her of Jennie's wish to tell her something. The designing girl knew now that her only course for success was in gaining the cooperation of Mary. But how should she commence? What ought she to say to further alienate the trusting Mary?

"Mary, I am engaged to John Lewis," she began, hoping that as she proceeded she would think of the right words to say. "By our standards, his life is mine, for I saved it. Did you ever risk your life for him? Did you ever suffer pain and almost death for him as I have? See this!"

She hastily bared her shoulder, and drew out her bare arm. At sight of the scarred, deformed member, Mary shrank back and hid her eyes in her hands.

The girl vehemently continued, "I got this in turning aside the knife that Cross-eyed Mike was directing towards John's heart! I pushed my body between the two men, and got this instead of him. It was my life I risked to save him, for it might not have been my arm that received the thrust. And I almost lost it, too, Mary Austin, for it was not known for a long time whether I would live. Have you ever gone through that danger for him? Honestly, would you risk your life for him, as I have done?"

"No, no!" echoed Mary, appealing to her mother. The suggestion was too hideous, reinforced as it was by all the scars meant. Then she grasped her emotional fright, tenaciously, and turned back to the girl. She forced herself to look upon the mute evidence of the creature's sacrifice. A surge of pity swept her—of pity for the girl and an awed love of her that she had risked her very life to save the man she loved. She went to the girl, closed her eyes to shut out the sight of the scar, bent down and pressed her lips upon the poor, maimed arm. Jennie watched her wonderingly.

"His life is mine," she said, vaguely. "I have saved it."

"You are right," Mary said. "Your claim is greater than mine. I shall not try to take him from you."

"And you give him to me?" asked Jennie, her face lighting up with a great joy.

"I have no claim on him," replied Mary. "Especially no such claim as you say. I am not engaged to him."

"And you really give him to me?" the girl repeated.

"Yes."

"Huh!" said the girl, significantly. "You do not love him."

Thrown off her guard, Mary sank down and rested her face in her hands.

"But I do love him!" she remonstrated. "I love him better than any one I know. What shall I do?" Then, she gave way to violent sobbing.

Jennie did not answer but bent pitying glances on the weeping girl. Mrs. Austin went very white. For the first time she realized fully Mary's feeling toward John Lewis. She now knew that whether right or wrong, there were days of suffering ahead for her daughter. The situation was grave; the time was critical. The sooner settled, one way or another, the better it would be for all concerned. She went to the phone and asked John Lewis to come immediately.

By the time he arrived, in wonder, at the Austin home, both the girls had been led to realize that the situation depended primarily upon his decision. It was an unpleasant solution and hard on Mary's self-respect, but inevitable. As he entered, his eyes rested upon Mary. Prompted by his great love for the girl, and shook out of his reserve by her apparent suffering, he was about to go to her, when he turned and saw the triumphant gleam in Jennie's eyes. He stopped amazed.

"Jennie Wise! What are you doing here?" Then, his gaze turned to the unrevealing countenance of Mrs. Austin.

"What am I doing here?" Jennie echoed. "Really, Johnnie, I hardly know what I am doing here. One thing that I do want you to do is to confirm that I saved your life at this expense." And she turned up the wounded arm to his view.

It was time for John to blanch in surprise and fear. Again, his sins had found him out. A cold sweat broke out on his brow. The blow had fallen. Both Mary and her mother were aware of his perfidy, now. Every cherished hope was blasted. There was no course but to give up to Jennie's machinations. She had scored a victory!

Then, the redeemed manhood in him came into the ascendency. He would be true to right and the honesty of his heart, whatever came. He had been sincere in his love for Mary; and that honest love of his had done her a wrong. There was but one course of honor left open to him. He went to Mary and took her hand in honest sympathy, and sank in contrition upon the floor by her chair.

"Mary, I love you above anything else in the world," he declared. "In my selfishness I did not know what a wrong I was doing you. Forgive me, Mary! I know you can never trust me, now; I know your love has changed to hate for such a false creature as I am. I dare not ask for love; but, please dear, forgive me! I will go out of your life forever, if you say so; but oh, do forgive me! I meant no harm!"

Jennie watched him with a sneer on her painted face. Mary had not repelled him. Instead, her hand had sought his head, and was resting in confident love upon it. There was but one thought in Mary's mind now: John was being torn from her—and she loved him so!

"John, come here!" imperiously commanded Jennie. "I hate to break in on that mushy sentiment of yours; but she has already given you up, and I suppose hates you as she ought to. Come here, I say!"

But Mary clung to him. With one arm about his neck now, she looked up defiantly at Jennie.

"John," she said, with her eyes upon Jennie, "I have never risked my life to save yours; but I want to state what is true, that I would willingly give my very life to save your soul from this woman!"

For an instant Mrs. Austin thought that Jennie would pounce upon Mary in insane, passionate, anger. But despite her provocation, the girl stood firm. She could be calm when occasion demanded. Then, with chin well up, she said peremptorily:

"John, come here!"

Obediently, John arose and went to her. He hung his head in impotent shame. He had wanted to refuse. He had done his best. But in spite of his remorse and repentence, Jennie had won; and he must go back into his old life. Otherwise, a scandal would be set loose upon Mary's innocent head. He well knew Jennie's upscrupulous methods. Whatever came to him, he must save Mary from scandal and vituperation. He was doomed!

For a moment, Jennie appraised the deserted Mary, with a triumphant pity. Then, she turned to John.

"It appears to me, John, that you are fonder of this girl than you are of me," she chided.

"Yes; Jennie, I love her," he replied honestly.

"And I hate her, and could tear her to shreds!" exclaimed Jennie, viciously. John did not reply.

"John, you are mine!" she continued.

"You saved my life once," he admitted, doggedly.

"And so you are mine!' emphasized the girl. "But when I marry a man, he has got to love me better than any other woman, or I'll kill her! Your life is mine, but I am going to give it to her. And when she shall descend to the very portals of death for you, John, only to find that you are ungrateful and unappreciative, I hope she will feel as I do now. But I give you to her, so go!" And with a vigorous push which caught him off his guard, she sent him reeling in Mary's direction. Then, she turned, and fled into the darkness. None of them ever saw her again.

Mrs. Austin watched for a moment the pure joy in her daughter's face, as John, recovering from the rude shove, walked towards her. Then, she turned sadly; and closing the door behind her, left the two together.

* * * * *

Peyton planned his course of action relative to the enforced circumstances. He could not return to his pulpit until the two years of vacation should be past. Neither could he supinely sit down, to await the arrival of the time limit. Instead, he would go out from Warburton and preach where and whenever he could secure a hearing. To fit himself more efficiently for the work to be done, he shut himself up in his study with the Bible, and the books Wanda had presented him. In prayer, and studious reason, he re-examined the grounds of his faith. Then, he came forth more determined than ever to prosecute to the limits of his ability, efforts to neutralize the effects of his earlier teachings, and to set the human soul free from the bondage of evolution and all its hideous train.

But his plan for the time was unexpectedly postponed. During all this time, his one great happiness had centered in the sunny love of little Fairy Mason. Never was man more subjugated by imperious childhood than was the lone heart of Peyton Harker by the lovely Fairy. Wanda, in her great love for him, had steeled her heart stubbornly to protect her weak defense against his wish for her to be more than counsellor to him. In fact, she avoided him as far as she could. Peyton found far more evidences of welcome at the bungalow of Mrs. Mason than in the home of Wanda Reese.

And so, on the eve of his planned-for itinerary, the phone-bell rang in his study, and he arose from his reading to hear the voice of Mrs. Mason coming over the wire.

"Mr. Harker, Fairy is very ill. She calls for you. The doctors give no hope; and I am wild with fear. What can I do?"

"Be brave, Mrs. Mason," he counseled, while a great chill of despair clutched at his own heart. "I will come to her at once. In your love and bravery, my own determination, and God's favor, we shall save her."

In this, another great crisis in his life, Peyton sank upon his knees in fervent prayer to God. With his mind at rest in the consolation that Christ's enduring presence alone can give, he went to the bedside of the little one.

After days of watching, the child grew better. Up from the pallid shadow of the valley, the little life clambered once more to ruddy strength, bringing with her the joy of life's sweet hopes to despondent hearts. Fairy out of danger, and his strength no longer pitted against the dread destroyer, Peyton suddenly realized how he had carried the burden of not only Fairy, but the worry of Stella as well. He was exhausted. He shut himself up in his apartments and rested and slept. He went forth only a few hours each day to tone up his strength by walks in the open air.

Towards the close of the week following the beginning of the convalesence of Fairy, Mrs. Mason phoned him:

"Fairy is still better, Mr. Harker. You must come to see her. She is nearly strong enough now for one of the old-time romps. And, oh yes, I wanted to tell you something else. I have just received a letter from Guy's lawyer at Washington. Guy died a few days ago. It seems he has been married again to some woman there, and he willed her all the property he had, except what he had settled upon Fairy and myself before he left. He did, however, mention Fairy in his will, and has sent her the family heirloom, his grandmother's pearl necklace. I think it very considerate of him, don't you? After all, I am feeling sad, today. Guy and I were very happy together. But I guess I feel more sorrow for our lost happiness than I do for him personally. I do wonder who it was he married."